

The Classical Review

DECEMBER 1904.

Two meetings of the Classical Association of Scotland are reported at length in the *Proceedings* for 1904, a volume of about 110 pages, published at Edinburgh by Messrs. H. and J. Pillans and Wilson. At the Glasgow meeting on December 5, 1903, Prof. G. G. Ramsay in his presidential address on 'the Classics and popular education' advanced reasons and quoted authorities to show that 'the intellectuality of classical study' was its great merit, and criticised the 'new educational legislation enacted by the Scottish Department' contained in the circular of February 16, 1903; Prof. J. S. Phillimore in a vigorous paper 'On the best present lines of defence for Classics' maintained that an effort should be made to get 'the whole body of arts to combine against anti-educationists' since Classics were 'the first line of defence for all humane or liberal education'; Prof. Butcher emphasised the importance of improved methods and Mr. Parker Smith and others continued the discussion. Dr. J. G. Kerr read an instructive paper on 'Latin in a Science School' (Allan Glen's School, Glasgow).

At St. Andrews on March 12, the subscription was raised to 7s. 6d. After a brief address from the President, Prof. J. Burnet, in a paper on 'Form and Matter in Classical Teaching,' which drew from subsequent speakers a number of well deserved encomiums, advocated 'pure scholarship' against 'research' as the classical ideal, and put in a plea for verse composition as a trainer of the mind. Incidentally he made some caustic comments on the way in which 'critical' texts of authors are now often constructed and pass undetected. The Headmaster of Fettes, Dr.

Heard, read a paper on 'the place of Unseens in the curriculum.' He urged that 'the Unseen should be judged by a literary and not merely a linguistic standard' and spoke of the great utility of sight reading. The Committee was empowered to watch the forthcoming Education Bill, and, if necessary, to call a special meeting.

A brief account of the May meeting of the Association for England and Wales was given in our issue for June, and the *Proceedings* of the same are now published (by Mr. John Murray) and will be in the hands of a number of our readers. The next meeting will be held in London on January 6 and 7, and we understand that the Lord Chancellor, who has shown his continued interest in Classical Studies in a recent speech at Oxford, will be proposed as President for the coming year. The place of meeting and the details of the programme have yet to be settled; but it is probable that the pronunciation of Latin will be one of the subjects discussed. The Association has not ceased to grow and now counts 900 members, one of its most recent adherents being the Oxford Chancellor, Lord Goschen. The influence of the Association seems to be penetrating the provinces, if we may judge from the fact that a local Association has been started in Manchester with a first meeting whose conspicuous success was largely due to the energy of the new professor of Latin at the Victoria University. May the example prove infectious!

Congregation at Oxford has declared against 'Optional Greek' by 200 votes to 164, a result which must affect the fate of the proposals of the Studies Syndicate at Cambridge now under discussion.

ON SOME TRAGIC FRAGMENTS.

[The numeration is Nauck's (1889).]

p. 780 Astydamas 8. 4 ἐνεκα τῶν ἔστιν εἰρεῖν ἄνδρ' εἶα—καὶ τοῦτον οἱ ζητοῦντες εἰσι μυριοί. Mr. Tucker in last month's number is right, I think, in reading ἔτεσι for ἔστιν: but when he supposes that Porson must have written ἐν δ' ἑκατόν ἔστιν ἔργον ἄνδρ' εἰρεῖν εἶα, he is mistaken. Porson's note is 'Malim ἐν δ' ἑκατόν ἔστιν ἔργον—κεῖ—εἰσι μυριοί.' At the time he wrote it Porson may not have discovered his own canon, or he may have thought (as Nauck thought) that this was not the sort of verse to which it was applicable. Certainly it sounds like Comedy; but my paper in *C.R.* 1902 p. 252, where I suggested ἄνδρ' εἰρεῖν εἶα as probable (like *Eur. fr.* 411), will show how easily the order might have been changed. 'Though the seekers be μυριοί' would be κἄν ὦσι (Grotius): καὶ . . . εἰσὶ would mean 'and yet (καίτοι) the seekers are μυριοί: this would refer to the philosophers, like Diogenes who went about saying ἄνδρα ζητῶ: cf. *Bato Com.* 2. 3 καὶ τὸν φρόνιμον ζητοῦντας ἐν τοῖς περιτάτοις καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδοδρακότα.

p. 790 Chaerephon 36

πλοῦτος δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὰς ὅλας τιμὰς ἰὼν οὐκ ἔσχεν ὄγκον ὥστε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν ἀλλ' ἔστι σεμνός· ἐν δὲ δώσει (or δώσει) βροτῶν ἡδὺς συνοικεῖν καὶ τιν' εἰληχῶς χάριν.

In *C.R.* 1899 p. 5 I suggested that in the first line we had a corruption of τάκολαστα or τάκολαστον, remarking that the contrary was σωφροσύνη, and leaving σώφροσιν to be read in v. 3 by any one who ventured. Whether this is right or not, Mr. Tucker makes a step by reading now

πλοῦτος δὲ πρὸς μὲν τάκολαστα πᾶς ἰὼν οὐκ ἔσχεν ὄγκον ὥστε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἄσεμνος· ἐν δὲ σώφροσιν βροτῶν ἡδὺς συνοικεῖν καὶ τιν' εἰληχῶς χάριν.

For his ἄσεμνος makes a good opposition to ὄγκον, which is here used in a good sense, 'dignity,' as in *Alexis* 263. 5 φέρει δὲ τοῖς μὲν χρωμένους δόξης τιν' ὄγκον, τοῖς δ' ὀρώσιν ἡδονήν, κοσμὸν δὲ τῷ βίῳ.—ἄσεμνος is corrupted in *Sannyrion* 1 (I p. 793 Kock) πέλανον καλοῦμεν ἡμῖς οἱ θεοὶ ἃ καλεῖται ἄσεμνος τάλφιθ' ἡμεῖς οἱ βροτοί: so *Meineke* and *Cobet*, where the MSS. give ἃ καλεῖται

σεμνός.—But I cannot think that this superfluous πᾶς is right; I had thought of πρὸς μὲν τάκολαστιμ' εἰσιών, but ἀκολάστμος is a somewhat hazardous formation, and though εἰσιών could be said of wealth entering a house, one would expect then πλοῦτος γὰρ εἰς μὲν . . .

p. 812 Moschion 2

ὦ καὶ θεῶν κρατοῦσα καὶ θνητῶν μόνη μοῖρ', ὦ λιταῖς ἄρωτε δυστήνων βροτῶν πάντολμ' ἀνάγκη. . . .

For ἄρωτε Mr. Tucker suggests ἄπτωτε 'with ears averted from.' Nauck's ἀτεγκτε would be normal Greek; but I suspect that here the true word was ἀτρεπτε: *Plut. de Stoic. repugn.* p. 1056 c τὴν δ' εἰμαρμένην αἰτίαν ἀνίκητον καὶ ἀκώλυτον καὶ ἀτρεπτον ἀποφαίνων αὐτὸς Ἄτροπον καλεῖ . . . from 'Arist.' de *Mundo* p. 401^b 8-19, seemingly: οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀνάγκην οὐκ ἄλλο τι λέγεσθαι πλὴν τοῦτον, οἰονεὶ ἀνίκητον οὐσίαν ὄντα, εἰμαρμένην δὲ διὰ τὸ εἰρεῖν τε καὶ χωρεῖν ἀκωλύτως, πεπωμένην δὲ διὰ τὸ πεπερατώσθαι πάντα . . . τέτακται δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸ γεγονός μίᾳ τῶν Μοιρῶν, Ἄτροπος, ἐπεὶ τὰ παρελθόντα πάντα ἀτρεπτά ἔστιν . . . If so, the author of that treatise is, as *Osann* reasonably thought, *Chrysippus*.

Kaibel *Ep.* 507 μοίρη ὑπ' ἀτρέπτῳ. 727 μετὰ μοῖραν ἀτρεπτον. This therefore was an established attribute of μοῖρα or ἀνάγκη, like the first line and the epithet πάντολμος and the ζυγόν following.

p. 820 Sosiphanes 2

νῦν σοὶ πρὸς ὄψιν (at the sight) θυμὸς ἡβᾶτω, γέρον· νυνὶ δέ γ' ὀργὴν ἡνίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν.

ὀργὴν λαβεῖν ἡνίκ' ἡδικοῦ 'to grow angry when you were being wronged' might have been preceded by τότε ἔδει, but not by νῦν δέ: therefore in *C.R.* 1899 p. 5 I gave νῦν δέ σέ γ' ὀργὴν ἡλίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν. Mr. Tucker now offers νῦν δέ σ' ἐς ὀργὴν ἡλίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν, rendering it 'now might you take in wrath the great injuries you suffered.'

But surely this is no improvement, in the absence of any evidence that Greek ever said ἐς ὀργὴν λαβεῖν τι. On the other hand ὀργὴν λαβεῖν is good Greek; as ὀργὴν ἔχειν is 'to be in a state of anger' like νόσον ἔχειν,

so ὀργὴν λαβεῖν is 'to conceive anger' at the moment (νῦν) like νόσον λαβεῖν: e.g. Dem. 743 ταύτην τὴν ὀργὴν νῦν ἐπὶ τούτῳ λάβετε. But what νῦν δὲ γ' should be there is no means of determining: to the conjectures Nauck records add νῦν δὲ γὰρ by Naeke *Opusc.* I 46. A scribe may have found merely νῦν δὲ ὀργὴν, for it was their

common practice to insert γ' to fill up a hiatus between vowels; or it may have been originally νῦν δὲ σὺν ὀργὴν ἡλικ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν corrupted to νῦν δὲ σ' . . . as in Soph. *O.C.* 721 νῦν σὺν τὰ λαμπρὰ ταῦτα δὲ φαίνειν ἐπη was corrupted to νῦν σοὶ . . . δὲ . . .

W. HEADLAM.

ADVERSARIA UPON FRAGMENTA TRAGICORUM ADESPOTA.

[The Numeration is Nauck's (1889).]

frag. adesp. 115:

τοῦ σώματος γὰρ εἶνεχ' οἱ πολλοὶ πόνοι
τοῦδ' εἶνεκ' οἶκον στέφανον ἐξηρμήκαμεν,
λευκὸν τ' ὀρύσσειν ἄργυρον σπείρειν τε γῆν,
τά τ' ἄλλ' ὅσ' ἢ ἡμεῖς ὀνόμασιν γιγνώσκο-
μεν.

Read τὰ τ' ἄλλ' ἃ σεμνοῖς κ.τ.λ.

frag. adesp. 118:

τίς ὧδε μῶρος καὶ λίαν ἀνεμμένος
εὐπιστος ἀνδρῶν ὅστις ἐλπίζει θεοὺς
ὅστων ἀσάρκων καὶ χολῆς πυρρομένης,
ἃ καὶ κυσὶν πεινώσιν οὐχὶ βρώσιμα,
χαίρειν ἀπαρχαῖς καὶ γέρας ἴλαχεῖν τόδε;

Read καλεῖν. [In the first line the ἀνεμμένος of Grotius is surely an improvement.]

frag. adesp. 124:

σοφὴ μὲν ἦμην, ἀλλὰ πάντ' οὐκ εὐτυχίς.

The order is bad and ἦμην will not do. Another version gives ἀλλὰ οὐ πάντα εὐτυχίς. I suggest

σοφὴ μὲν ἦν, ἀλλ' οὐ τι πάντα γ' εὐτυχίς.

frag. adesp. 126:

ὦ κακοὶ
κἀνάξιοι τῆς ἐμῆς σποράς,
Αἰτωλίδος ἀγάλματα μητρός.

This may possibly be right, since in Eur. *fr.* 386 there occurs ἀνόνητον ἄγαλμ', ὦ πάτερ, οἴκοισι τεκόν. But the context there is unknown, whereas in the present place Heracles is reproaching his children ὡς μαλακοῦς. I suspect that the true word was ἀτάλατα, i.e. '(petted) nurselings.' They were παῖδες μητέρων τετραραμμένοι (Aesch. *S. c. T.* 777).

frag. adesp. 270:

Hesychius has ἱτραπεζίτην Πάριν τὸν παρα-

βάντα τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ ἀτιμάσαντα τὸν Μενέλαον.

Read τραπέζα τίτην (i.e. τὸν ἀτίζοντα τὴν τράπεζαν). This is nearer to the explanation than an otherwise possible τραπέζαπάτην.

frag. adesp. 310:

ἐχθροῖς ἀπιστῶν οὐποτ' ἂν ἱπάθοις βλάβην

is surely dubious Greek, but might be quoted by commentators on Xen. *An.* 6. 6. 25 (βίαν χρῆναι πάσχειν αὐτόν). There Stephanus read βίαια (IA for N), although Cobet (*N.L.* p. 526) seems to think that he himself is the first to make the correction. Here I should read λάβοις.

frag. adesp. 457:

†ἐν τῷ λαλεῖν δεῖ μὴδὲ μηκύνειν λόγον.

The schol. on Soph. *El.* 1437 quotes this by way of illustration along with his interpretation δι' ὅτ' ἂν παῖρά γε μὴ ἀνατεταμένως φθέγγεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐλαφρῶς. The equivalent of ἐλαφρῶς and the opposite of ἀνατεταμένως is ἀνετῶς, of which ἐν τῷ is an easy corruption.

[Here, by the way, emend Hesych. ἀνετῶς ἀνατεταμένως = Soph. *fr.* 583. This being directly opposite to the truth, we must emend with ἀτενῶς.]

frag. adesp. 458:

In the schol. on Soph. *O.C.* 1375 (quoting this fragment) a variant story is given of the cause of the curse of Oedipus upon his sons. The schol. proceeds καὶ ἔοικεν τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἡκεῖν ἐπὶ πολλοὺς, ὥς καὶ παρὰ τινι αὐτὰ ἴκεκτῆσθαι πρὸς τὸ γελοιώτερον κ.τ.λ.

Read ἐκκείσθαι. The story is 'set forth.'

frag. adesp. 484:

†φθείρει γὰρ ἡ πρόνοια τὴν ἀβουλίαν.

The sense, if obtainable at all, is unsatis-

ON SOME TRAGIC FRAGMENTS.

[The numeration is Nauck's (1889).]

p. 780 Astydamas 8. 4 ἐνεκα τῶν ἔστιν εὐρεῖν ἄνδρ' ἕνα—καὶ τοῦτον οἱ ζητοῦντες εἰσὶ μυρίοι. Mr. Tucker in last month's number is right, I think, in reading ἔτεσιν for ἔστιν: but when he supposes that Porson must have written ἐν δ' ἑκατόν ἔστιν ἔργον ἄνδρ' εὐρεῖν ἕνα, he is mistaken. Porson's note is 'Malim ἐν δ' ἑκατόν ἔστιν ἔργον—κεῖ—εἰσὶ μυρίοι.' At the time he wrote it Porson may not have discovered his own canon, or he may have thought (as Nauck thought) that this was not the sort of verse to which it was applicable. Certainly it sounds like Comedy; but my paper in *C.R.* 1902 p. 252, where I suggested ἄνδρ' εὐρεῖν ἕνα as probable (like Eur. fr. 411), will show how easily the order might have been changed. 'Though the seekers be μυρίοι' would be κἄν ὧσι (Grotius): καὶ . . . εἰσὶ would mean 'and yet (καίτοι) the seekers are μυρίοι: this would refer to the philosophers, like Diogenes who went about saying ἄνδρα ζητῶ: cf. Bato Com. 2. 3 καὶ τὸν φρόνιμον ζητοῦντας ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις καὶ ταῖς διατριβαῖς ὥσπερ ἀποδεδρακότα.

p. 790 Chaeremon 36

πλοῦτος δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὰς ὅλας τιμὰς ἰὼν οὐκ ἔσχευε ὄγκον ὥστε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν ἀλλ' ἔστι σεμνός· ἐν δὲ δώσει (or δώσει) βροτῶν ἡδὺς συνοικεῖν καὶ τιν' εἰληχῶς χάριν.

In *C.R.* 1899 p. 5 I suggested that in the first line we had a corruption of τὰκόλαστα or τὰκόλαστον, remarking that the contrary was σωφροσύνη, and leaving σώφροσιν to be read in v. 3 by any one who ventured. Whether this is right or not, Mr. Tucker makes a step by reading now

πλοῦτος δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὰκόλαστα πᾶς ἰὼν οὐκ ἔσχευε ὄγκον ὥστε καὶ δόξης τυχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἄσεμνος· ἐν δὲ σώφροσιν βροτῶν ἡδὺς συνοικεῖν καὶ τιν' εἰληχῶς χάριν.

For his ἄσεμνος makes a good opposition to ὄγκον, which is here used in a good sense, 'dignity,' as in Alexis 263. 5 φέρει δὲ τοῖς μὲν χρωμένοις δόξης τιν' ὄγκον, τοῖς δ' ὀρώσιν ἡδονήν, κοσμὸν δὲ τῷ βίῳ.—ἄσεμνος is corrupted in Sannyrion 1 (I p. 793 Kock) πέλανον καλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ θεοὶ ἃ καλεῖτ' ἄσεμνος τᾶλφιθ' ἡμεῖς οἱ βροτοί: so Meineke and Cobet, where the MSS. give ἃ καλεῖται

σεμνῶς.—But I cannot think that this superfluous πᾶς is right; I had thought of πρὸς μὲν τὰκόλαστίμ' εἰσίων, but ἀκολάστισμος is a somewhat hazardous formation, and though εἰσίων could be said of wealth entering a house, one would expect then πλοῦτος γὰρ εἰς μὲν . . .

p. 812 Moschion 2

ὦ καὶ θεῶν κρατοῦσα καὶ θνητῶν μόνῃ μοῖρ', ὦ λιταῖς ἄτρωτε δυστήνων βροτῶν πάντολμ' ἀνάγκη, . . .

For ἄτρωτε Mr. Tucker suggests ἄτρωε 'with ears averted from.' Nauck's ἀτεγεκτε would be normal Greek; but I suspect that here the true word was ἀτρεπτε: Plut. *de Stoic. repugn.* p. 1056 c τὴν δ' εἰμαρμένην αἰτίαν ἀνίκητον καὶ ἀκώλυτον καὶ ἀτρεπτον ἀποφαίνων αὐτὸς Ἄτροπον καλεῖ . . . from 'Arist.' *de Mundo* p. 401^b 8-19, seemingly: οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀνάγκην οὐκ ἄλλο τι λέγεσθαι πλὴν τοῦτον, οἰοῦναι ἀνίκητον οὐσίαν ὄντα, εἰμαρμένην δὲ διὰ τὸ εἶρην τε καὶ χωρεῖν ἀκωλύτως, πεπωμένην δὲ διὰ τὸ πεπερατώσθαι πάντα . . . τέτακται δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸ γεγονός μία τῶν Μοιρῶν, Ἄτροπος, ἐπεὶ τὰ παρελθόντα πάντα ἀτρεπτά ἐστιν . . . If so, the author of that treatise is, as Osann reasonably thought, Chrysippus.

Kaibel *Ep.* 507 μοῖρῃ ἵπ' ἀτρέπτῳ. 727 μετὰ μοῖραν ἀτρεπτον. This therefore was an established attribute of μοῖρα or ἀνάγκη, like the first line and the epithet πάντολμος and the ζυγόν following.

p. 820 Sosiphanes 2

νῦν σοὶ πρὸς ὅψιν (at the sight) θυμὸς ἡβάτω, γέρον· νυνὶ δέ σ' ὀργὴν ἡνίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν.

ὀργὴν λαβεῖν ἡνίκ' ἡδικοῦ 'to grow angry when you were being wronged' might have been preceded by τότε ἔδει, but not by νῦν δέ: therefore in *C.R.* 1899 p. 5 I gave νῦν δέ σ' ὀργὴν ἡλίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν. Mr. Tucker now offers νῦν δέ σ' ἐς ὀργὴν ἡλίκ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν, rendering it 'now might you take in wrath the great injuries you suffered.'

But surely this is no improvement, in the absence of any evidence that Greek ever said ἐς ὀργὴν λαβεῖν τι. On the other hand ὀργὴν λαβεῖν is good Greek; as ὀργὴν ἔχειν is 'to be in a state of anger' like νόσον ἔχειν,

so ὀργὴν λαβεῖν is 'to conceive anger' at the moment (νῦν) like νόσον λαβεῖν: e.g. Dem. 743 ταύτην τὴν ὀργὴν νῦν ἐπὶ τουτονὶ λάβετε. But what νῦν δὲ γ' should be there is no means of determining; to the conjectures Nauck records add νῦν δὲ γὰρ by Naeke *Opusc.* I 46. A scribe may have found merely νῦν δὲ ὀργὴν, for it was their

common practice to insert γ' to fill up a hiatus between vowels; or it may have been originally νῦν δὴ σὺν ὀργὴν ἡλικ' ἡδικοῦ λαβεῖν corrupted to νῦν δὲ σ' . . . as in Soph. *O.C.* 721 νῦν σὺν τὰ λαμπρὰ ταῦτα δὴ φαίνειν ἐπη was corrupted to νῦν σοὶ . . . δὲ . . .

W. HEADLAM.

ADVERSARIA UPON FRAGMENTA TRAGICORUM ADESPOTA.

[The Numeration is Nauck's (1889).]

frag. adesp. 115:

τοῦ σώματος γὰρ εἶνεχ' οἱ πολλοὶ πόνοι
τοῦδ' εἶνεκ' οἶκον στέφανον ἐξηυρήκαμεν,
λευκὸν τ' ὀρύσσειν ἄργυρον σπείρειν τε γῆν,
τά τ' ἄλλ' ὅσ' ἡμεῖς ὀνόμασιν γιννώσκο-

μεν.

Read τὰ τ' ἄλλ' ἃ σε μνοῖς κ.τ.λ.

frag. adesp. 118:

τίς ὦδε μῶρος καὶ λῖαν ἀνειμένως
εὐπιστος ἀνδρῶν ὅστις ἐλπίξει θεοῖς
ὄστων ἀσάρκων καὶ χολῆς πυρηνμένης,
ἃ καὶ κυσὶν πεινώσιν οὐχὶ βρώσιμα,
χαίρειν ἀπαρχαῖς καὶ γέρας ἴλαχεῖν τόδε;

Read καλεῖν. [In the first line the ἀνειμένως of Grotius is surely an improvement.]

frag. adesp. 124:

σοφὴ μὲν ἦμην, ἀλλὰ πάντ' οὐκ εὐτυχής.

The order is bad and ἦμην will not do. Another version gives ἀλλὰ οὐ πάντα εὐτυχής. I suggest

σοφὴ μὲν ἦν, ἀλλ' οὐ τι πάντα γ' εὐτυχής.

frag. adesp. 126:

ὦ κακοὶ
κἀνάξιοι τῆς ἐμῆς σπορᾶς,
Αἰτωλίδος ἀγάλματα μητρός.

This may possibly be right, since in Eur. *fr.* 386 there occurs ἀνόντην ἀγαλμ', ὦ πάτερ, οἶκοισι τεκῶν. But the context there is unknown, whereas in the present place Heracles is reproaching his children ὡς μαλακοῦς. I suspect that the true word was ἀτὰλματα, i.e. '(petted) nurselings.' They were παῖδες μητέρων τεθραμμένοι (Aesch. *S. c. T.* 777).

frag. adesp. 270:

Hesychius has ἵτραπεζέτην Πάρην τὸν παρα-

βάντα τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ ἀτμάσαντα τὸν Μενέλαον.

Read τραπεζατίτην (i.e. τὸν ἀτίζοντα τὴν τράπεζαν). This is nearer to the explanation than an otherwise possible τραπεζαπάτην.

frag. adesp. 310:

ἐχθροῖς ἀπιστῶν οὐποτ' ἂν ἱπάθοις βλάβην

is surely dubious Greek, but might be quoted by commentators on Xen. *An.* 6. 6. 25 (βίαν χρῆναι πάσχειν αὐτόν). There Stephanus read βίαια (IA for N), although Cobet (*N.L.* p. 526) seems to think that he himself is the first to make the correction. Here I should read λάβοις.

frag. adesp. 457:

ἔν τῳ λαλεῖν δεῖ μηδὲ μηκύνειν λόγον.

The schol. on Soph. *El.* 1437 quotes this by way of illustration along with his interpretation δι' ὅπως ἂν παῖρά γε μὴ ἀνατεταμένως φθέγγεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐλαφρῶς. The equivalent of ἐλαφρῶς and the opposite of ἀνατεταμένως is ἀνετῶς, of which ἐν τῳ is an easy corruption.

[Here, by the way, emend Hesych. ἀνετῶς ἀνατεταμένως = Soph. *fr.* 583. This being directly opposite to the truth, we must emend with ἀτενωσ.]

frag. adesp. 458:

In the schol. on Soph. *O.C.* 1375 (quoting this fragment) a variant story is given of the cause of the curse of Oedipus upon his sons. The schol. proceeds καὶ ζοικειν τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἦκειν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς, ὡς καὶ παρὰ τινι αὐτὰ ἱκετῆσθαι πρὸς τὸ γελοιότερον κ.τ.λ.

Read ἐκκεῖσθαι. The story is 'set forth.'

frag. adesp. 484:

ἱφθείρει γὰρ ἡ πρόνοια τὴν ἀβουλίαν.

The sense, if obtainable at all, is unsatis-

factory. The true reading is probably $\theta\eta\rho\tilde{\alpha}$ and the thought is that 'caution lies in wait to catch (or stalks) folly.' The same error occurs in Soph. fr. 463.

κημοῖσι πλεκτοῖς πορφύρας †φθείρει γένος,
where the schol. on Ar. *Eg.* 1150 and also Hesychius, with their λαμβάνουσιν, point to $\theta\eta\rho\tilde{\alpha}$.

frag. adesp. 507 :

ὦ δέσποτ' ἴναξ ἔστι τοῖς σοφοῖς βροτῶν
χρόνῳ σκοπεῖσθαι τῆς ἀληθείας πέρι.

Read, I think, in explanation of both the corruption and the two datives

ὦ δέσποτ', ἀνετ' ἔστι κ.τ.λ.

i.e. 'wise men must leave it (refer it) to time to discern the truth.' Whether ἀνετέ(α) was explained by ἀνακτέ(α), or the

loss in ἀν<ετ'> ἔστι left ἀν(α) to be explained as ἀναξ, is not of much moment.

frag. adesp. 537 :

κρείσσόν τ' ἀμύνειν· καθανεῖν γὰρ εὐκλεῶς
ἢ ζῆν θέλοιμ'· ἀν δυσκλεῶς †γε καθανών†.

Read δυσκλεῶς κατὰ πτακόν.

[*Obiter* I may remark that this use of θέλω ἢ for θέλω μᾶλλον ἢ is more common than is generally supposed, and I believe the text is sound in Aesch. *Ag.* 1321

ἀπαξ ἔτ' εἰπὲν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρῆνον θέλω
ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς,

so far at least as ἢ θρῆνον is concerned. Casandra will not deliver her own dirge, but a ῥῆσις of another kind. It may be that $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\iota\nu$ was written by Aeschylus, but there seems no reason why ῥῆσις should not be a 'deliverance'.]

T. G. TUCKER.

PLATONICA.—VI.

(Continued from Vol. XVII. p. 22.)

PROTAGORAS.

327 c Following the principle of what I wrote before in this *Review* (xv. 296), that ἀνθρώποις is an error due to ἀνθρωπος preceding and ἀνθρώπους following, I should now read ἐν νόμοις καὶ παιδείᾳ (or possibly δικαστηρίοις) τετραμμένων. Cf. just below οἷς μῆτε παιδεία ἐστὶν μῆτε δικαστήρια μῆτε νόμοι.

328 E There is no point in αὐτῶν τούτων, *this very question*. Read τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων, meaning that, if he raised the same question, he would be told the same things.

334 A πολλὰ οἷδ' ἂν ἀνθρώποις μὲν ἀνωφελῇ ἐστὶ, καὶ σιτία καὶ ποτὰ καὶ φάρμακα, καὶ ἄλλα μυρία, τὰ δὲ γε ὠφέλιμα· τὰ δὲ ἀνθρώποις μὲν οὐδέτερα, ἵπποις δέ, τὰ δὲ βουσὶν μόνον, τὰ δὲ κυσίν.

I think now that these words would run best and fit best into their context, if we read ἀνθρώποις <τοῖς> μὲν ἀνωφελῇ τοῖς δὲ γε ὠφέλιμα, the τοῖς having dropped out through its likeness to the syllable preceding, and τοῖς δὲ having then been assimilated to the τὰ δὲ thrice following.

341 D I do not myself feel much difficulty in the superfluous δοκεῖν after οἶμαι (οἶμαι . . . παίζειν καὶ σοῦ δοκεῖν ἀποπειρᾶσθαι). If any

exists, we might get over it by reading παίζει καὶ σοῦ δοκεῖ πειρᾶσθαι. But cf. for instance the δοκεῖ in Dem. 15. 11.

353 D ἢ κἂν εἴ τι τούτων εἰς τὸ ὕστερον μηδὲν παρασκευάζει, χαίρειν δὲ μόνον ποιεῖ, ὅμως δ' ἂν κακὰ ἦν, ὅ τι μαθόντα χαίρειν ποιεῖ καὶ ὅπιοι;

In the apodosis ὅμως δ' ἂν κακὰ ἦν most recent editors read εἴη for ἦν against all the MSS. Mr. Adam defends ἦν, saying 'the imperfect is used because the answer "no" is expected and desired . . . See Goodwin *M.T.* p. 190, § 503'; but there is no such principle known to Greek Grammar and Goodwin affords, I think, no parallel to this passage. Surely ὅμως δὲ κακὰ ἐστὶν; would equally have invited the answer 'no.' I do not however think we should read εἴη. I would retain ἦν but read παρεσκευάζε and ἐποίει. The imperfects, a very slight change, give a good, if not a better, sense, because excess in pleasures constantly does entail subsequent evil and therefore a supposition to the contrary goes naturally into the imperfect. In 350 B ἔλεγες has been rightly restored for λέγεις.

In view of other passages where ὅ τι μαθόν occurs, ὅ τι μαθόντα seems sound here, but I should make it accusative singular, not

with Mr. Adam nominative plural. That would personify food and drink too much.

355 A ἡ ἀρκεί, as a question, may be right, if a full stop is put before it. An alternative, which seems to me not improbable, is ἡ < μὴ > ἀρκεί governed by the εἰ preceding.

355 C ἡττώμενος—ὑπὸ τίνος; φήσκει τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, φήσομεν νῆ Δία.

So punctuate all the books I have looked at. But I would join νῆ Δία with τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.

357 A τί ἂν ἔσφιν ἡμῖν τὸν βίον; ἄρ' ἂν οὐκ ἐπιστήμη; καὶ ἄρ' ἂν οὐ μετρητική τις; ἐπειδὴ περ ὑπερβολῆς τε καὶ ἐνδείας ἔστιν ἡ τέχνη; ἐπειδὴ δὲ περιττοῦ τε καὶ ἀρτίου, ἄρα ἄλλη τις ἢ ἀριθμητική;

The use of ἐπειδὴ here seems to deserve notice. It is never used, I think, with the indicative, like ὅτε, to mean *when, whenever*. It cannot therefore here mean simply that, *whenever* it is a matter of more and less, it is μετρητική, and, *whenever* of odd and even, ἀριθμητική. Nor on the other hand does *since* make sense here, because only one of the two propositions can be true. It seems rather, if I understand it, to mean *when once, after we have once settled that*, or something similar. But I do not know any exact parallel. Perhaps *postquam* might be so used.

εἴπερ δὴ . . . εἰ δὲ δὴ may naturally occur to one as possibilities, but they are hardly probable.

357 E Agreeing that in οὔτε αὐτοὶ οὔτε τοὺς ὑμετέρους παῖδας παρὰ τοὺς τοῦτων διδασκάλους . . . πέμπετε a verb is missing after αὐτοί, I should conjecture it to be something like *μανθάνετε* rather than the ἴτε, φοιτᾶτε, etc., that have been suggested. I take it that as a rule the pupils of the sophists were young men, not fathers of families.

360 D οὐκ ἐτι ἐνταῦθα οὐτ' ἐπινεύσαι ἠθέλησεν ἐσίγα τε.

Read οὐδ' ἐπινεύσαι ἠθέλησεν, ἐσίγα δέ. 'He would not even nod assent but remained silent.' I cannot think οὔτε . . . τε is good Greek after οὐκ ἐτι, which would have the effect of negating both, the τε clause as much as the οὔτε clause. οὐδέ *not even* is also much more pointed in the context.

360 E χαριῶμαι οὖν σοι καὶ λέγω ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

λέγω may be right enough, but in view of the frequent corruption of futures λέξω is worth suggesting.

361 C For ἐξελεθῆν I would now write simply ἐλθεῖν.

The following explain themselves.

311 A The third ἐνδον (after εἰκός) might be better omitted. So perhaps σοφόν after σέ in 310 D.

312 D Perhaps ὅτι ἂν εἴποιμεν, echoing the question. Cf. *Euthyphro* 2 c: *Laws* 662 A. Or τί, ἂν εἴπωμεν;

328 A οὐ ῥᾶδιον < ἂν > οἶμαι εἶναι.

333 B σοφία < τ' > ἐναντία καὶ σωφροσύνη αὐ φαίνεται.

GORGIIAS.

448 A

ΓΟΡ. παρέσσι τούτου πείραν, ὦ Χαιρεφῶν, λαμβάνειν.

ΠΩΛ. νῆ Δεῦ' ἂν δέ γε βούλη, ὦ Χαιρεφῶν, ἐμοῦ.

There should be no stop after νῆ Δία. It does not assent to what precedes, but goes with what follows, just as *e.g.* in 463 D, μὰ τὸν Δία, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς συνήμι ὅ τι λέγεις, the μὰ τὸν Δία must go with οὐδὲ αὐτὸς συνήμι, because there is nothing preceding for it to refer to. Cf. 458 D. So often in Aristophanes νῆ or μὰ Δία etc. goes with what follows, in spite of some word (ἀλλά etc.) intervening: see Blaydes on *Plut.* 202: *Lys.* 594: and Gilbert ad *Xen. Mem.* 2. 7. 4.

448 C πολλὰ τέχνηα ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰσὶν ἐκ τῶν ἐμπειρῶν ἐμπείρως ἡρμημένα.

Not only is the adverb ἐμπείρως somewhat oddly used, but it adds nothing to ἐκ τῶν ἐμπειριῶν. The Schol. on Hermogenes (Walz 4. 44, cited by Thompson) gives ἐκ τῶν ἐμπειριῶν ἐμπειρίας, which helps to make one doubt. Should we read ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἐμπειριῶν ἐμπειρίας? (Cf. Thompson's *Gorgias* Appendix p. 181 n. 1, and compare Gorgias (?) *Hel.* 18 πολλὰ πολλοῖς πολλῶν with ἄλλοι ἄλλων ἄλλως here.)

458 E ῥητορικὸν φῆς ποιεῖν οἷός τ' εἶναι, ἐὰν τις βούληται παρὰ σὸν μανθάνειν; Ναί. οὐκοῦν περὶ πάντων ὥστ' ἐν ὀχλῷ πιθανὸν εἶναι;

For ὥστε, which has no propriety here and is distinctly awkward, read ὥς γε, ὥς γ' ἐν ὀχλῷ having a limiting sense. ἐν γε ὀχλῷ (πιθανώτερος) occurs immediately after. In *Prot.* 348 C the Bodleian codex has ὥστε μοι ἔδοξεν for ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ ἔδοξεν, and in *Rer.* 352 D the same mistake is made.

465 D ἀκρίτων ὄντων τῶν τε ἱατρικῶν καὶ ὑγιεινῶν καὶ ὀψοποικῶν.

If τῶν ἱατρικῶν has ὑγιεινῶν added to it, the balance of the sentence seems to require that <καὶ ἡδέων> be inserted after ὀψοποικῶν. Dobree wished to omit ὑγιεινῶν καὶ

472 B ἐγὼ δ' ἂν μὴ σὲ αὐτὸν ἔνα ὄντα μάρτυρα παράσχωμαι ὁμολογοῦντα περὶ ὧν λέγω, οὐδὲν οἶμαι ἄξιον λόγον μοι πεπεράνθαι περὶ ὧν ἂν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ᾗ· οἶμαι δ' οὐδὲ σοί, ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ σοι μαρτυρῶ εἰς ὧν μόνος.

There seem to be here two noticeable things: (1) the apodosis οὐδὲν οἶμαι κ.τ.λ. ought to contain some sort of future, (Hirschig proposed οὐδὲν <ἂν> οἶμαι): (2) in οἶμαι δ' οὐδὲ σοί we should like to find the sense *you will not be satisfied either*, whereas it can only mean *I think you will not have succeeded either*, and the repetition of οἶμαι is quite pointless and weak, when οὐδ' αὖ σοί would have been enough. From these two considerations may we not infer that Plato wrote a δόξει or δόξεν with πεπεράνθαι and that the same is understood with οὐδὲ σοί? He wrote, that is, something like οὐδὲν οἶμαι ἄξιον λόγον μοι <δόξεν> πεπεράνθαι.

478 c Should εὐδαιμονέστατος be εὐδαιμονέστερος? The ἀθλιώτερος following strongly suggests it, and MS evidence on this point is worth very little. Cf. the variations in 473 c and 490 E. The εὐδαιμονέστατος in D, followed as it is by δεύτερος κ.τ.λ., proves nothing.

480 c παρέχειν μύσαντα εὖ καὶ ἀνδρείως ὥσπερ τέμνειν καὶ κᾶν ἱατρῷ.

In view of Bergk's <μῆ> μύσαντα cf. Aristides 43. 34 ἀπαλγῆσαντας ἔαν καί, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον, μύσαντας φέρειν.

482 B c οἶμαι . . . καὶ τὴν λῖραν μοι κρεῖττον εἶναι ἀναρμοστέιν τε καὶ διαφωνεῖν καὶ χορὸν ᾧ χορηγοῖν καὶ πλείστους ἀνθρώπους μὴ ὁμολογεῖν μοι κ.τ.λ.

Thompson notices the irregularity of the optative. It is strange that neither he nor anyone else has seen what must have happened, namely that an ἂν has been lost, probably after κρεῖττον or in καί (read κᾶν).

483 A φύσει μὲν γὰρ πᾶν αἰσχρὸν ἐστίν ὅπερ καὶ κάκιον, τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι.

For πᾶν, which gives no sense here, when τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι is attached to it, πᾶσιν and παντί have been suggested. Does it not stand for πον, a word which is plausibly restored for πολὺ in 488 E?

485 B ἔγωγε ὁμοίωτατον πάσχω πρὸς τοὺς φιλοσοφοῦντας ὥσπερ πρὸς τοὺς ψελλιζομένους καὶ παίζοντας. ὅταν μὲν γὰρ παιδίον ἴδω, ᾧ ἔτι προσήκει διαλέγεσθαι οὕτω, ψελλιζόμενον καὶ παίζον, χαίρω τε καὶ χαρίεν μοι φαίνεται καὶ ἐλευθέριον καὶ πρέπον τῇ τοῦ παιδίου ἡλικίᾳ. ὅταν δὲ σαφῶς διαλεγόμενον παιδαρίον ἀκούσω, πικρὸν τί μοι δοκεῖ χρήμα εἶναι καὶ ἀνὰ μόν τὰ ὅσα καὶ μοι δοκεῖ δουλοπρεπές τι εἶναι· ὅταν δὲ ἀνδρὸς ἀκούσῃ τις ψελλιζόμενον ἢ παίζοντα ὄρεῖ, καταγελαστόν φαίνεται καὶ ἀνανδρὸν καὶ πληγῶν ἄξιον· ταῦτόν οὖν ἔγωγε τοῦτο πάσχω καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φιλοσοφοῦντας.

In this Morstadt proposed to bracket καὶ παίζοντας, καὶ παίζον, and ἢ παίζοντα ὄρεῖ. Schanz brackets καὶ παίζοντας and (after Cobet) ψελλιζόμενον καὶ παίζον.

It is plain, I think, that παίζειν in this passage cannot be taken in the general sense of playing games. The two clauses, ᾧ ἔτι προσήκει διαλέγεσθαι οὕτω and ὅταν σαφῶς διαλεγόμενον παιδαρίον ἀκούσω, without a word being said about games, make it clear that παίζειν cannot refer to games generally, but must be taken in the very closest connexion with ψελλιζεσθαι referring to the same thing. Moreover, Plato would surely not have condemned all games in this wholesale manner, nor have laid it down that any grown man who played a game deserved a beating. Παιδιά is not limited in its sense to children's games, and both Plato and Aristotle distinctly recognise the legitimacy of the thing for men.

Understanding παίζειν then to refer to the same thing as ψελλιζεσθαι, I presume Morstadt's reason for his omissions was the inappropriateness of the word. When a child lisps and stammers, it is not doing so in play. Yet παίζειν is actually used here twice over to describe the child's trick of speech, as well as a third time in reference to the grown man, where it is hardly suitable either, for in him it is affectation, folly, or a natural defect, not παιδιά. If we had only the first two passages, I should not doubt that we ought to read πταίνοντας and πταῖον. In the Aristotelian *Problems* 3. 31 the question is διὰ τί τῶν μεθύνοντων ἢ γλῶττα πταίει; and the word occurs there several times over. It may be said that the use of ἢ γλῶττα, as the subject, makes all the difference, and that to speak of a child as πταῖον would suggest something quite different. By itself it would; but πταίω coming after ψελλίζομαι is fairly clear. We should certainly not say simply 'a child trips' in this sense, but we could quite well say 'a child stammers and trips,' leaving

'in speech' to be understood, just as we say that a man 'wanders' or 'rambles,' that is, in speech or in mind. With the corruption of *παῖω* to *παῖζω* perhaps I may compare the corruption which I have conjectured in Xen. *Cynegeticus* 9. 5 of *πτήξας* to *πίσας* (*πίσας* ὡς ἐπὶ γῆν). In the *Prometheus* 885 the MSS. vary between *πταίων* and *παίων*, and in the *Rhetorica ad Alex.* 1425a 38 *πταίσωσιν* has been restored with great probability for *πίσωσιν*. In *Bacchae* 1141 *πτήξασα* is recognised as a blunder for *πήξασα*.

But *ἡ παίζοντα ὁρά* does not admit of being changed to *ἡ πταίνοντα ὁρά*. *ὁρά* is of course impossible with *πταίνοντα*, and *ἡ* should be *καί* as before. We should expect, that is, *ψελλιζομένην καὶ πταίνοντος*. If my conjecture is right, as I think it must be, we must omit *ἡ παίζοντα ὁρά* altogether, taking it to have been added by some one who found *παίζοντας* and *παίζον* in the other places and thought the word ought to occur here too with a suitable verb. It is plain, though the editors do not seem to notice it, that *ὁρά* is quite as unsuitable to *παίζοντα*, if the latter refers to speaking, as it would be to *πταίνοντα*. In any case therefore, even if we keep *παίζοντας* and *παίζον*, either *παίζοντα* is wrong or *ἡ παίζοντα ὁρά* must be omitted, as Morstadt proposed.

486 C *παῖσαι δ' ἐλέγχων, πραγμάτων δ' εἰμυσίαν*

ἄσκει καὶ ἄσκει ὁπόθεν δόξεις φρονεῖν.

The second *ἄσκει* may be right, but it looks to me like one of those unintentional repetitions of a word, by which we all sometimes go astray in writing, and perhaps especially in copying. Now in 526 D all the MSS. give *σκοπῶ ὅπως ἀποφανοῦμαι*, which is certainly right, but T has *γρ. ἀσκῶ*; and for *σκοπῶν* which follows two lines later the text of Eusebius has *ἀσκῶν*, which Burnet adopts. Cf. Cobet *N.L.* p. 629 on Xen. *Symp.* 4. 42 and Marchant's note *ad loc.* Should we read *σκοπεῖ* here? *σκοπεῖ ὁπόθεν* would closely resemble *σκοπῶ ὅπως*.

492 C *ἡ πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἄβλιοι γεγονότες εἴσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ καλοῦ τοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης;*

τὸ καλὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης does not strike me as very Platonic. I would suggest *τοῦ καλοῦ τοῦτον* with *τῆς* . . . *σωφροσύνης* in apposition. The confusion is a well-known one. Notice the use of *ταῦτα τὰ καλλωπίσματα* just below.

499 A *οὐκοῦν ὁμοίως γίγνεται κακὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον ἀγαθὸς ὁ κακός;*

κακὸς καὶ ἀγαθός seems to make no sense. Omit *κακὸς καὶ* and read *ἀγαθός* only, to which the preceding questions lead up. *κακὸς καὶ ἀγαθός* may be due to *τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακόν* just before.

512 D *ἀλλ', ὦ μακάριε, ὅρα μὴ ἄλλο τι τὸ γενναῖον καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἢ τοῦ σφύζειν τε καὶ σφύζεσθαι. μὴ γὰρ τοῦτο μὲν, τὸ ζῆν ὅπόσον δὴ χρόνον, τὸν γε ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄνδρα ἐπαιτεῖν ἐστί.*

There is probably no parallel to be found anywhere, at any rate in good Attic Greek, for *μὴ* . . . *ἐπαιτεῖν ἐστί*. Goodwin (*M.T.* 269) gives two, *Prot.* 312 A and *Meno* 89 c, remarking that the latter may be interrogative. So may the former, and it would be most unsafe to build on them. We are therefore left with this passage alone, as Aristotle's *μήποτε* can not count for very much. Is it too bold to suggest that *μὴ* here represents *οἶμαι*? The *οἶ* was perhaps lost after *αι* in *σφύζεσθαι* and the *μαι* then changed to *μὴ*. For *οἶμαι* thus standing independently at the beginning of a sentence see Ast's *Lexicon* s.v. p. 423: Stallbaum on *Gorg.* 460 A: 472 B C above: *Rep.* 608 D, etc. *ἡ* has also been suggested.

513 C *τῷ αὐτῶν γὰρ ἦθει λεγομένων τῶν λόγων ἕκαστοι χαίρουσι, τῷ δὲ ἀλλοτρίῳ ἄχθονται,*

The dative *ἦθει* seems a little questionable, unless indeed a word is lost. But perhaps we should read *(ὁμο)λογουμένων*. In *Lysias* 12. 71 *ὁ ὁμολογημένος ἐπ' ἐκείνων καιρὸς* seems fairly certain for *ὁ λεγόμενος*, where the tense is wrong.

The following proposals explain themselves.

450 B *περὶ λόγους ἐστὶ τοιούτους οἱ τυγχάνουσιν κ.τ.λ.* Read *τοιούτους*.

456 B *φημὶ δὲ καὶ (read κἂν) εἰς πόλιν . . . ἐλθόντε . . . οὐδαιμοῦ ἂν φανήναι.*

469 A *οὐ χρή οὔτε τοὺς ἀζηλώτους ζηλοῦν οὔτε τοὺς ἀθλίους <εὐδαιμονίζειν> ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖν.*

480 B *μενεῖ* for *μένει*.

510 B *φίλος . . . ὅνπερ οἱ παλαιοὶ τε καὶ σοφοὶ λέγουσιν, ὁ ὁμοῖος τῷ ὁμοίῳ.*

Read *ὅπερ* for *ὅνπερ*. Hirschig *ὥσπερ*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA TO THE AVES.

IN these notes the accentuation and punctuation of quotations from the Manuscripts and from the Princeps have been normalized.

1 τὸ μὲν παρὰ τὸ πείθεσθαι, τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὸ εἶχεν τὴν ἐλπίδα. Princeps. For πείθεσθαι read πείθειν τὸν ἑταῖρον, i.e. πειθεταιρ. πειθεταιρ was mistaken for πείθεσθαι. (Mehler proposes πείθεσθαι <τῷ ἑταίρῳ>, but the meaning is wrong, Blaydes simply πείθειν.) This gives the form Πειθέταιρος, with meaning that befits the character, and the comment accounts for both parts of the compound.—τὸ μὲν, τὸ δέ are read in VFE. The alternative reading (inferior) would be not τῷ μὲν, τῷ δέ (RM), adopted by the editors, but τοῦ μὲν, τοῦ δέ.

13 οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀρνεοπώλων. Princeps. For ὀρνεοπώλων (MSS.) read ὀρνεοπωλίων. ἐκ requires a word signifying the place, not the person. Cf. ὀρνεοπολίων (VT², ὀρνεοπωλείων Princeps) and χυτροπωλίων (I²E, χυτροπωλείων Princeps) in the next Scholium, and Hesychius s.v. ὀρνεα.

31 Ἀκέστορα γὰρ ὁμῶς εἰκὸς λαβεῖν πληγὰς, εἰ μὴ συστρέψῃ τὰ πράγματα. Princeps. Read

Ἀκέστορ, σέ γ' ἄρ' ὁμῶς εἰκὸς λαβεῖν πληγὰς, εἰ μὴ σὺ στρέψῃ τὰ πράγματα.

The division of the tribrach after the second short syllable in the received text (Dindorf, Diibner) is suspicious. In Aristophanes, at least, there are only three instances of this, where the second word is γάρ (*Ach.* 71 is corrupt), and all three occur in the first foot. For σέ, cf. the reading of V in the next verse, σὺ στρέψῃ. Here στρέψῃ is inadmissible, but it suggests the right form. Bentley proposed συστρέψῃ.

66 καὶ τάχα ἂν εἴη κατὰ τὴν πάλαι σημασίαν τὸ ἔρω ἔρον· μετεβλήθη δὲ εἰς τὸ ὦ. Princeps. Read καὶ τάχα ἂν εἴη κατὰ τὴν παλαιάν (MSS.) σημασίαν γεγραμμένου (MSS.) τὸ ἔρον (MSS.) ἔρω (ἔρω MSS.), μετελήφθη (MSS.) δὲ εἰς τὸ ὦ. The form ἔρω is required. For the meaning of παλαιὰ σημασία, as here used, cf. Schol. *Il.* A 104 ὦ: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει 'ὄν ποτ' Ἀχιλλεύς'. μήποτε δὲ πεπλάνηται, γεγραμμένου τοῦ ο ὑπ' ἀρχαϊκῆς σημασίας ἀντὶ τοῦ ω, προσθεῖς τὸ ν. Schol. Pind. *Nem.* i. 34 καταλείπεται δὲ τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ σημασίᾳ τὸ 'ἐσλός'. ἢ γὰρ ἀντίστροφος ἀπῆγχε τὸ ν (i.e. ἐσλούς). Cf. the Scholium on 935.

68 φασιανὸς δὲ συνοφάντης παρὰ τὸ φαίνειν μετὰ φασιανῶν εὐρισκόμενος. Princeps. Read φασιανικός (ΓΜ): συνοφάντης, παρὰ τὸ φαίνειν, <ῆ> 'μετὰ φασιανῶν εὐρισκόμενος.' The definitions obviously are alternatives.

96 εἴξασιν ἐπιτρίψαι σε: δύναται μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐποπος λέγειν, οὗτοι ζητοῦσιν σε ἐπιτρίψαι διὰ τὴν ὄψιν· δύναται δὲ ἐφ' ἐαυτῶν λέγειν, εἰκόσιν οὗτοι ἡμῶς ἐπιτετριφέναι ὥδε ἐλθόντες, εἰ ἐφόβει αὐτοὺς τὸ προσωπεῖον τὸ δὲ εἴξασιν, ἢ εἰκόσιν ἢ παρεγένοντο. Princeps. This is the reading also in V, except that V has δύναται καὶ ἐφ' and omits the last clause, which is found in ΓΕ. Read the alternative clause thus: δύναται δὲ καὶ ἐφ' ἐαυτῶν λέγειν, 'ἦξασιν οὗτοι ἡμῶς ἐπιτετριφέναι ὥδε ἐλθόντες,' ἐκφοβεί γὰρ (R) αὐτοὺς κτέ.

The alternative definition of εἴξασιν at the end of the Scholium, ἢ εἰκόσιν ἢ παρεγένοντο, points unmistakably to ἦξασιν or possibly ἦκασιν (both these forms occur in late Greek): *these fellows* (the Epops and his attendant) *have come out to do us, to judge from their looks.* ὥδε ἐλθόντες balances διὰ τὴν ὄψιν of the preceding interpretation, *to judge from your appearance.* After ὥδε ἐλθόντες the commentator adds ἐκφοβεί γὰρ αὐτοὺς τὸ προσωπεῖον. Note that ἦξασιν is the reading in the text of the play in both M and U, and that the editors of Suidas before Gaisford read ἦξουσιν s.v. ὑγεία. Küster even says: 'apud Aristophanem hodie minime recte legitur εἴξασιν.'

102 πότερον ὄρνις: ἐπαίξε· δέον εἰπεῖν ἀνθρώπος ἢ ταῶς· ὀξύνεται δὲ καὶ περισπᾶται. Princeps. V has πότερον ὄρνις ἢ ταῶς: ἐπαίξεν· δέον εἰπεῖν ἀνθρώπος ταῶς εἰπεν· ὀξύνεται δὲ καὶ περισπᾶται. Read πότερον ὄρνις ἢ ταῶς: ἐπαίξε· δέον γὰρ (E) εἰπεῖν 'ἀνθρώπος, ταῶς' εἴπε· δασύνεται (Suidas) δὲ καὶ περισπᾶται.

VE have the proper lemma; in Γ and the Princeps the lemma conforms to the mistaken interpretation of the text of the play which substituted ἀνθρώπος for ὄρνις, not for ταῶς. The correct interpretation in V appears rewritten in M: εἶδε γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἀνθρώπος, καὶ εἴπε ταῶς. The form of the note in E (εἴπεν ἢ ταῶς) shows how the error arose. Van Leeuwen's interpretation of the text, 'homo an nugator,' assumes the wrong form of the Scholium.—For Suidas's δασύνεται (Cod. AV), cf. Athen. ix. 398 A: οἱ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ δασύνουσι καὶ περισπῶσι (on the authority of Seleucus). Cf. also 379 ■

(Trypho). Suidas (Cod. V) has the lemma ταῶς.

107 Read the lemma νῶ; βροτώ. The following interpretation clearly indicates the sharp separation of the two words. Γ has νῶ, βροτώ; and νῶ; βροτώ is found in the text of the play in BC and Pal. 167.

109 μὴ ἀλλὰ θατέρου τρόπου πέπονθε. Princeps. This is repeated by Dindorf (Dübner). Read μάλα θατέρου τρόπου(V): πέπονθε τοῦτο (τοῦτο Suidas), the text is corrupt.

129 Read ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν μου πρῶ: νῦν οὐ 'τὴν πρῶταν,' ἀλλ' ἴσον τῷ 'ἐν ὥρᾳ πρῶ'. οὕτω γὰρ μονοσυλλάβως λέγουσι τὸ 'πρῶ'. Εὐπολις Βάπταις.

ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἔξεις ἄγαθα πολλὰ δὴ πρῶ. τοῦ 'πρῶ' γὰρ συναίρεσις ἐστὶ τὸ 'πρῶ'. διὸ δέχεται τὸ δὲ 'πρῶν' περισπᾶται. Καλλιμάχος.

οὐ πρῶν μὲν ἡμῖν ὁ τραγηδὸς ἤγειρε.

None of the MSS. contain the whole Scholium, but its elements are found in VRTEM, in clear order, except the quotation from Callimachus, which is due to Suidas (s.v. πρῶ), but in a connexion that warrants the belief that it was a part of the original Scholium. Cf. Io. Alex. 32, 7 (Herodian, i. 494, 7); Cramer, *An. Ox.* ii. 463, 13; Hesych. πρῶ; Eustath. 1025, 38; Schol. *Ecol.* 291.

The important word is πρῶν (τὸ δὲ πρῶν περισπᾶται). This stands as πρῶ V, πρῶιν Γ and Suidas (Cod. AV.), πρῶν EM. M places the iota subscript with care. Cf. Herodas v. 62.—For ἐν ὥρᾳ πρῶ at the beginning of the Scholium, cf. Thuc. vii. 39: τῆς ὥρας πρότερον.

149 Read Δίδυμος δὲ φησι Λέπρεον ὀνομάσθαι ἢ διὰ τὸ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν (RT² αὐτόν V) λεπρὰν εἶναι (Toup for λέπειν): διαφαίνονται γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς πέτρας γὰρ εἶναι αὐτοῖσι ποικίλας τῷ χρώματι καὶ διαλείκους ὁμοίας τοῖς τὰς ὄψεως λεπρῶσι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ὀνομάσθαι ἐκ τοῦ πάθους ἢ διὰ τὸ τοὺς πρῶτως οἰκήσαντας κτέ.

This is the reading of V, except in the two places indicated, confirmed in the main by RT²EM, but R omits the whole of the alternative clause, ἢ διὰ τὸ τοὺς πρῶτως κτέ., and this fact has confused the interpretation. Didymus offered two (ἢ... ἢ...) explanations of the name Λέπρεον. The place was so called either because it was situated in a rocky, scaly, 'leprous-looking' country, or because its inhabitants were in fact lepers.

Here διαφαίνονται ἐκ τῆς ὀρεινῆς means occupy a conspicuous position at the foot of the mountains, and (as the mood shows) is parenthetical and probably not a part of the original explanation of Didymus. The fact has been observed by modern travellers (cf. Curtius, *Peloponnesos*, ii. 64) that the ruins of ancient Lepreum lie on a spur of the mountains that overlook the valley of the Strovitz. Cf. ἀπὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου τραχέος ὄρους in the abbreviated form of the Scholium in Photius (s.v. Λέπρεον), which is repeated by Suidas.

167 οὗτος δὲ διαβάλλεται ὡς μετάβλητος (εὐμετάβλητος MSS.) τοὺς τρόπους: πρὸς γὰρ τῇ κιναιδίᾳ καὶ δειλίᾳ καὶ ὀψοφαγίᾳ καὶ νοσφισμῷ καὶ πονηρίᾳ, ὀνειδίζονται τὸν Τελείαν. Princeps. For τὸν Τελείαν at the end V has τὸ Τελέα, Γ² τῷ Τελέα. Read ὀνειδίζουσι τὸδε Τελέα, cast this reproach on Teleas, namely εὐμεταβλήτω εἶναι. The ordinary interpretation of the vulgate, in addition to his unnatural lust, Teleas is reproached also with cowardice, etc., ignores γὰρ and violently separates δειλία and the following datives from κιναιδίᾳ, with which they are naturally construed in dependence on πρὸς. Küster, observing the difficulty, read καὶ ἐπὶ δειλίᾳ in both Suidas and the Scholium, but this leaves γὰρ unexplained.

189 Read Βοιωτοὺς δίδον αἰτούμεθα: πολέμοι ἦσαν οἱ Βοιωτοὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις συλλαβόντες Λακεδαιμονίους κτέ. The MSS. have συμβαλόντες, but συμβάλλω expresses the idea of hostile encounter, not assistance. The confusion of λαβών and βαλόν in the MSS. is frequent.

267 τοροτίξ: οἱ μὲν καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ ἔποπος λέγουσιν εἶναι, οἱ δὲ ὀρνίθος τινος περιπταμένον. Princeps repeated by Dindorf (Dübner). With Γ read οἶμαι καὶ ταῦτα (πάντα V) τοῦ ἔποπος ἐπικαλουμένου (ποικιλλομένου V), οἱ δὲ κτέ. The reading ποικιλλομένου may be sound; it would refer to the art with which the Epops has embellished his song (227-262) by the new word of call, τοροτίξ. Cf. the use of ποικίλλω in the rhetoricians.

299 Read φησὶ δὲ Δίδυμος τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα κηρύλος λέγεσθαι. VT² have κηρύλος, but the testimony of the MSS. in such a case is of slight weight. τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα, however, points to this form. Didymus held the view that most birds received their names from their peculiar notes (σχεδὸν γὰρ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ὀρνέων ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς ἔχει τὴν ὀνομασίαν Athen. 392 f), and von Leutsch suggests that Didymus associated the κηρύλος with the cry κῆρυξ. Cf. Dion. de Av. ii. 7:

καὶ τὰς ψῆδς δ' εἰ καταπαύειν μέλλοιεν (i.e. αἱ ἀλκύνες), κῆνξ, κῆνξ συνεχῶς ἐπειποῦσαι συγκῶσιν. Schol. Luc. i. 178 identifies the κῆνξ (the male ἀλκύν) with the κηρύλος.

Similarly read at the end of the Scholium : τοῦτο οὖν ἔστω σημεῖον τοῦ καὶ τὸν κηρύλον ἴσως παρὰ τὸ κείρειν ἡτυμολογηκέναι τὸν Ἀριστοφάνην ἀντέθηκε γοῦν αὐτῷ κουρέα. (VT² have κηρύλον.) The Scholiast's text of 299, therefore, read ὅστις ἔστι; κηρύλος, and κηρύλος, found in all the best MSS., in the text, is right. The form κηρύλος is a pure fiction. To foist it into Aristophanes's verse is a mistake, since it is not the poet's practice to explain his puns.

303 καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους τὸν πρῶνός τις ὦν κεβλήπυρίς τις ὀνομάζεται. Princeps repeated by Dindorf (Dübner).

The quotation from Hermippus is a crux. 'Non expedit.' Meineke. 'In Hermippo qu. an legendum κοπρώνης. Nescio; sed credo ὡς τις ὦν κοπρώνης.' Dobree. Küster desiderated better MSS. This help seems to be furnished by V, which has Θεμιστοκλέα (supported by Γ), πρῶν (i.e. πρῶην), and ὅστις. These readings were overlooked by Dindorf and Dübner. τὸν before πρῶν in V disturbs the rhythm, but τ might easily displace τό or γέ or δέ. τὸ πρῶην, *nuper*, seems to be possible. Read :

A. καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα τὸ πρῶην, ὅστις ὦν κεβλήπυρίς—

B. τίς ὀνομάζεται ;

The Scholiast, after quoting the fragment of Hermippus, remarks ὥστε ἐνθάδε ἢ (H. Jackson, ἢ the previous Editors) ἐκὰς ἡμάρτηται τὸ ἐν περὶ τὴν γραφὴν, so that in the verse of our poet (ἐνθάδε) as in that of Hermippus (ἐκὰς) the single word is a scribe's error. The verse of Hermippus, then, admitted the same sort of double interpretation as the verse of Aristophanes, which the Scholiast erroneously proposed to read :

νέροτος ἱέραξ φάττα κόκκυξ ἐρυθρόπους κέβλη πυρίς.

In the scurrilous tetrameter of Hermippus Θεμιστοκλέα depends in construction on some verb in the context, and the situation is similar to that in *Aves* 1290 ff., where birds' names are given to men: A. *And lately we brought Themistocles to book, who is indeed a κεβλήπυρίς*— B. *What's the name he gets?* The Scholiast, insisting that κεβλήπυρίς is two words, erroneously interprets the verse thus: καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα τὸ πρῶην, ὅστις ὦν κέβλη πυρίς τις ὀνομάζεται !

450 ἐν τοῖς πινακίοις: ἐπεὶ ἔθος ἦν τοῖς

ταξίαρχος διὰ κήρυκος ἀπαγγέλλειν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ στρατιώταις τὰ δεδογμένα. Princeps and the Editors, following the MSS Read διὰ κηρύγματος, for the fact cannot be established that the proclamation was oral. For κήρυγμα, the order inscribed on the πινακίον, cf. Schol. Pac. 1183: ἐν οἷς ἐγράφοντο οἱ στρατιωτικοὶ κατάλογοι καὶ τὰ κηρύγματα.

465 λαρινὸν ἔπος: . . . ὡς ἐν Λαρίσση μεγάλων βοῶν γνομένων ἔστι δὲ πόλις Θεσπρωτίας. The MSS. have Λαρίση (V) or Λαρίσση (ΓM). Read Λαρίνη, and cf. Athen. 376 c: ἡ ἀπὸ τινος κόμης Ἑπειρωτικῆς Λαρίνης. Cf. also Eustath. 1383, 2.

476 τεθνεὺς Κεφαλῆσιν: προσέπειξε τὸν δῆμον, Κεφαλῆς γὰρ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος φυλῆς. The Scholium, which occurs in ΓM, confirms Κεφαλῆς as the designation of the member of the deme. Cf. C.I.A. I. 398; IV. 2, 251b; and Steph. Byz. s.v. βοὸς κεφαλῆαι.

484 Δαρείου καὶ Μεγαβύζου: Δαρείος βασιλεὺς ἦν, Μεγαβύζος δὲ στρατηλάτης πορθήσας Μεμφίδα. Princeps. Read Μεμφίτας. In the MSS. we find Μεμφίδας V, Μεμφίδ... Γ, Μέμφιν M. The Princeps alone has Μεμφίδα, but the accusative of the name of the town is Μέμφιν, not Μεμφίδα. The accent of the word as reported on the incomplete form in Γ strongly supports the correction suggested by V. The construction is unobjectionable. One could say in the street even in Aristophanes's time (*Ach.* 164) πορθεῖν τινά τι. Cf. also Diod. xi. 32.

501 προκυλινδεῖσθαι: ἔαρος ἀρχομένου, ἱκτινος φαίνεται εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐφ' ᾧ ἡδόμενοι κυλινδόνται ὡς ἐπὶ γόνυ παίξας οἷν ὡς βασιλεῖ φησι τὸ κυλινδεῖσθαι ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων. Princeps. In the last part of the Scholium read: ἐφ' ᾧ ἡδόμενοι κυλινδοῦνται ὡς ἐπὶ γόνυ πέσας οἷν βασιλεῖ φησι τὸ 'κυλινδεῖσθαι,' ἴδιον γὰρ βασιλέως τὸ γονυπετεῖσθαι ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων. The last clause, ἴδιον γὰρ βασιλέως κτέ, occurs in VRFM.

πέσας (late aorist), found in the MSS. (παίξας only in the Princeps), seems to have misled Musurus, who joined ὡς ἐπὶ γόνυ with what precedes, omitted ἴδιον γὰρ... γονυπετεῖσθαι, and read as above. This is critical procedure run wild. His reading παίξας has been adopted by subsequent editors. Suidas (s.v. γονυπετεῖσθαι), as it frequently happens, is nearer the mark. Translate, *he uses the word κυλινδεῖσθαι, then, as if he had prostrated himself before the king.* The Scholiast represents Peithetaerus

as conceiving himself in the situation described. If this seems too imaginative, read *πέσαντος* (Suidas has *πίπτοντες*). For βασιλεί, cf. Herod. v. 86: ἐς γούνατα γάρ σφι αὐτὰ πείσιν and the usage with γονυπετεῖν.

521 Λάμπων δ' ὄμνυνσι: τῶν εἰκῇ δαιμόνων ὅτι πῶτοι οἱ Σωκρατικοὶ οὕτως ἐπετῆδενσαν ὀμνύναι. Princeps. This is practically the reading in the MSS. and is adopted by Dindorf (Dübner). Read <κατὰ> τῶν εἰκῇ δαιμόνων <οὐ> πῶτοι οἱ Σωκρατικοὶ ἐπετῆδενσαν οὕτως ὀμνύναι.

The introductory clause cannot be left in mid-air without construction. For κατὰ τῶν εἰκῇ δαιμόνων, cf. below κατὰ τῶν θεῶν and κατὰ τοῦ χηρός. οὐ was suggested by Bothe. The negative is required, since the following quotation from Sosicrates is introduced to prove (πολὺν γάρ) that this form of oath began in the time of Rhadamanthus. Furthermore, the phrase τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ Σωκράτους ὅρκοι ('of Socrates also') is a fixed part of the accounts of the 'Oath.' Cf. Suidas, Photius (both s.v. Παδαμάνθους ὅρκος); Schol. Plat. *Apol.* 21 ε; Apost. xv. 17; Eustath. 1871, 5.

574 αὐτίκα Νίκη πέταται: νεωτερικὸν το τὴν Νίκην καὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα ἐπετῶσθαι. Ἀρχένους γάρ φησι, καὶ τὸν Βουπάλου καὶ Ἀθηνίδος πατέρα, οἱ δέ, Ἀγλαοφόντα τὸν Θάσιον ζωγράφον, πηνὴν ἐργάσασθαι τὴν Νίκην. Princeps. In the second sentence the MSS. have ἀρχένους γάρ φησι καὶ τὸν βουπάλου καὶ ἀθηνίδος πατέρα, and Dindorf (Dübner) read Ἀρχένον γάρ φησι, τὸν Βουπάλου καὶ Ἀθηνίδος πατέρα.

Probably we should read Ἀρχερμον γάρ φασί τινες τὸν Βουπάλου καὶ Ἀθηνίδος πατέρα. No Ἀρχένους is known, and the word would naturally seem to be a corruption of the name of the father of Bupalus and Athenis. This was Ἀρχερμος. Cf. Plin. *N.H.* xxxvi. 11 (Cod. Bamberg); Tzetzes in Cramer, *An. Ox.* iii. 366, 4. For the name, cf. also Löwy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 1; *C.I.A.* IV. 1, 350 a and 373 (p. 181). With the corruption of the name the case shifted and the common interchange of φασί and φησί occurred. καὶ has no meaning in the vulgate; τινές, although a mere conjecture, furnishes a proper antithesis to the following οἱ δέ.

639 οὐδὲ μελλονικίαν: ὅτι βραδὺς ἦν περὶ τὰς ἐξόδους καὶ ὡς οἱ διαβάλλοντες οὐχὶ προνοητικὸς ἦν, ἀλλ' ἀμελητής: τινὲς δὲ φασί τὸ προνοητικὸν καὶ μὴ προπετὲς τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν εἶναι. VR.

For ἀλλ' ἀμελητής, which is repeated by Dindorf (Dübner), read, with E and Hesychius (s.v. μελλονικίαν), ἀλλὰ μελητής. Γ

has ἀλλὰ μελητής, and this is read also in the Princeps and Suidas (Med.). The very word μελλονικίαν implies ἀλλὰ μελητής.—The following τὸ προνοητικὸν καὶ μὴ προπετὲς must mean in respect of his qualities of foresight and caution, but this 'causal' accusative is doubtful. Musurus inserted διὰ in the Princeps. The rewritten form of the note in M, τινὲς δὲ φασί τῷ προνοητικὸν εἶναι τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν, suggests τῷ προνοητικὸν καὶ μὴ προπετῇ εἶναι τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν εἶναι (εἶναι lost before εἶναι), or possibly τῷ προνοητικῷ καὶ μὴ προπετεῖ τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν εἶναι.

648 Read ἀτὰρ τὸ δεῖνα: πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοῦτό φασί. In R (which has φησι) the relation of the note to the text is indicated by a signum before 648; in E (which omits τοῦτό φασί) the note is an interlinear above δεῖνα.

The tradition is preserved in some of the MSS. that the words ἀτὰρ τὸ δεῖνα (as ἴωμεν in the preceding verse) were spoken by Peithetaerus and Euelpides in concert. To 648 Γ prefixes the direction ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἐποψ and U οἱ δύο.

701 Read ξυμμεγνυμένων δ' ἑτέρων: τὰς συνουσίας μετέδωκεν. The note (omitted by VTM and the Princeps) is an interlinear over ξυμμεγνυμένων in Γ²E. For the accusative, cf. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 5: εἰ μὴ μεταδοίεν αὐτοῖς πυρούς.

767 τοῦ πατρὸς νεώττιον: ὡς καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, τοιοῦτον ὄντος, ἀποδρᾶναι ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς πανουργίας. Princeps. This is the reading of the Scholium also in the MSS. Read τοῦ πατρὸς νεώττιον: ὡς καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ τοιοῦτον ὄντος, <ἐκπερδικίσει δὲ> ἀποδρᾶναι, ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ πέρδικος πανουργίας. In support of the two corrections, cf. Suidas (s.v. ἐκπερδικίσει): τὸ διαδρᾶναι ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν περδίκων, πανούργων ὄντων. And Zonaras (s.v. ἐκπερδικίσει): διαδρᾶναι πανούργως: ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν περδίκων, πανούργων γὰρ τὸ ζῆον καὶ διαδιδράσκει τοὺς θηρευτάς. Cf. also Hesych. s.v. ἐκπερδικίσει; Apost. vi. 96 = Diog. ii. 57 (where ἀποδρᾶναι occurs).

778 ἄλλως (i.e. κύματά τ' ἔσβησε): ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσύχασεν ἢ θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα κατακλουμένη. The Scholium occurs only in Γ. Dindorf (Dübner) follow Victorius in reading κατακλουμένη for κατακλουμένη, but cf. Hesych. (s.v. κατακλουμένοι): ἐξοιστρούμενοι ('oestro liberati' Hemsterhuys), καταθελγόμενοι, and Phot. (s.v. κατακλουσαν): θέλγονσαν, πρᾶννονσαν.

It is significant that Victorius has this note, although it occurs only in Γ of existing MSS.

793 Read *εἰ τε μοιχέων*: ἀντὶ τοῦ 'μοιχὸς ὅστις ὦν ὑμῶν.' The scholium appears in this form in VRGE, except that VR read *ἄν* for *ὦν*. Dindorf (Dübner) read *ἔστιν* for *ὦν*, but erroneously, since *μοιχὸς ὅστις ὦν ὑμῶν* is a perfect paraphrase of *εἰ μοιχέων τις ὑμῶν ἔστιν ὅστις* of the text of the play.

800 Read *μεγάλα πράττει* κἀστὶ νυνί: παραγραφέντα ἐκ Μυρμιδόνων Αἰσχύλου. The MSS. have *παρὰ τὰ γραφέντα*, except Γ which reads *παραγραφέντα*.

807 ταυτὶ μὲν ἡκάσμεθα: διεσκέμμεθα. Princeps. Read *ἡκάσμεσθα: διεσκώμμεθα*. Musurus is responsible for *διεσκέμμεθα*, which occurs in none of the MSS. that have the note (VEM). For the form *διεσκώμμεθα*, cf. Suid. (s.v. ἀνεκάσασθε): ἀνασκώψατε (= Hesych. s.v. ἀνεκάσασθε, Bekker, *An. Graec.*, 596, 24), and Hesych. (s.v. εἰκάζειν): σκώπτειν, εἰκάζειν ('fort. γελοιάζειν' Meineke), τὸ λέγειν 'ὁμοίως εἰ τῷδε.'

822 ἄλλως (i.e. ἵνα καὶ τὰ Θεαγένους) λέγεται ὅτι μεγαλέμπορος τις ἐβούλετο εἶναι περαιτῆς ἀλαζῶν ψευδόπλουτος, ἐκαλείτο δὲ

'καπνός' ὅτι πολλὰ ὑπισχνούμενος οὐδὲν ἐτέλει. Εὐπολὺς ἐν Δήμοις.

The Scholium is found in this form in VGE, except that V omits *ἐν* before *Δήμοις*. It does not occur in RGM. *περαιτῆς* has given serious offence, and various substitutes have been proposed: *περιλαλητής* Casaubon; *καίπερ αἵτης* (l) Toup; *ἐπαίτης* or *προσαίτης* Meineke; *πράκτης* Kock; *πένης ὦν* or *καίπερ πένης ὦν* Blaydes; *πράτης* H. Jackson.

The Scholium furnishes another interesting case of the possible recovery of verses from a play now lost. The order of words in the Scholium is not possible in *prose*, and indicates that the writer unconsciously followed the order of words in Eupolis's verses. Adopting Mr. Jackson's substitute for *περαιτῆς*, the verses in the *Demi* may have run:

μεγαλέμπορος τις εἶναι βούλεται
πράτης ἀλαζῶν ψευδόπλουτος, Θεογένους,
καπνός δὲ καλεῖται, πολλὰ γὰρ ὑπισχνούμενος
οὐδὲν τελεῖ.

JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE.

THE DATE OF THE DIONYSALEXANDER.

PAP. OXYR. 663.

I AM not sure that the argument does not fix the date for this play even more precisely than its beneficent discoverers think. This is certainly the case if the corruption noted by them in l. 8 is, as I would suggest, nothing more than the writing of Π for Π' so that ΠΥΩΝΠΟΙ¹ stands for *περὶ ὧν*

ποιήσεως. When the insignificant omission is made good, a sense emerges which implies that when the Dionysalexander was produced the project for the legitimizing of the younger Pericles was either debating or accomplished. — 'Turning to the audience they talk with one another on the question how men may get themselves sons.'

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

THE OPENING SENTENCE OF THE VERRINES.

CIC. *Div. in Caec.* i. § 1. Si quis vestrum, indices, aut eorum qui adsunt, forte *miratur* me . . . ad accusandum descendere . . . una et id quod facio probabit, et . . . putabit.

Instead of the vulgate *miratur*, all the MSS. have *mirantur*, until corrected in the fifteenth century. This is true of Par. 7776 (eleventh century): it is true also of Par.

7823, which, though late, can be shown to have faithfully preserved the tradition which the now mutilated codex of Claudius Puteanus (Par. 7775, thirteenth century) derived from what must have been the archetype also of the famous ninth century MS., Regius 7774 A.

The explanation is that *mirantur* must have been a copyist's error for *mirabitur*.

The substitution of *v* for *h* is a common occurrence, which would result in this case in *mirantur*, passing easily into *mirantur*. This is one more instance of the need for paying attention to neglected errors in our

MSS., and the opening sentence of the *Verrines* should no longer be misquoted.

W. PETERSON.

McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.
Oct. 29, 1904.

HORACE, *ARS POETICA*, vv. 125 FOLL.

Si quid inexpertum scenae committis et
audes
personam formare novam, servetur ad unum
qualis ab incepto processerit, et sibi constet.
difficile est proprie communia dicere: tuque
rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus
quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus.
publica materies privati iuris erit, si
non circa vilem patulumque moraberis
orbem
nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpretes

I would suggest a way of throwing light upon the force of *proprie communia* and dispelling all ambiguity, by transferring here some lines (240-3) which cause an almost equal perplexity where they stand. If set before v. 128 they will shew that the force of *difficile* has been misapprehended, and remove the difficulty which is serious at first sight of taking *proprie communia dicere* in the most obvious sense 'to treat with originality themes that are common property.' It is always taken to mean 'it is hard, so do not attempt it.' But with this sense none of the proposed interpretations seem to suit the entire context. It is assumed that Horace is warning off the Pisos from a too difficult enterprise, and that *proprie communia dicere* is therefore in contrast with *Iliacum carmen deducis in actus*, and parallel to *proferre ignota indictaque*. This interpretation of Aeron (and Mr. Wilkes) who takes *communis* as *intacta, non ante dicta*, would do very well if the sentence stood alone. But, as Professor Wilkins says, the parallelism of *publica materies privati iuris erit* is too close to be denied, and *publica materies* cannot bear the sense of 'unappropriated material' because v. 133 speaks of translation.

Orelli's (and Dr. Johnson's) interpretation, 'it is difficult to give individuality to abstract types' is subject to the same grave objection that the parallelism of *publica materies* is ignored. Even if this could be, it does not suit so well as Aeron's view the

alternative parallelism with *ignota indictaque primus* which both these interpretations require. Neither is it much in the way of the ancient dramatists to individualise types.

Professor Wilkins offers another interpretation which has the merit of preserving the ordinary sense of *communis*. '(It is fairly easy to treat novel themes without inconsistency.) The difficulty arises when you endeavour to treat familiar themes in a distinctive and individual manner. You are selecting a theme from the *Iliad*: then you are wise to confine yourself simply to throwing Homer's poem into dramatic shape, instead of attempting an originality of handling which would probably lead you into inconsistencies.' On this view v. 128 whilst recommending *communis* dissuades from treating them *proprie*. This can hardly be right, for lines 131 foll. plainly give directions how to treat the theme *proprie*, with freedom and originality. It is not likely that a courtier like Horace would say to the Pisos 'It is too hard for you but this is how I should advise your betters to do it.' Moreover it would be very confusing to set *ignota indictaque primus* not parallel to *inexpertum* and *persona nova* but as belonging to the alternative contrasted with these. If now we set vv. 240-3

Ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi
quivis
speret idem, sudet multum frustra que
laboret
ausus idem: tantum series iunctura que
pollet
tantum de medio sumptis accedit honoris.

between v. 127 and v. 128 all these difficulties are removed and the sense is quite clear.

Horace has mentioned two courses

Aut famam sequere, aut sibi convenientia
finge. (v. 119)

In the eight lines which follow he has given

the guiding principles to be followed in each case. Now he says, 'I should prefer the first method and work on familiar material, trusting to lend it distinction by the handling. The ordinary man thinks this easy: but let him try: such is the power of judicious setting, such distinction is lent to plots familiar to all. It is not an easy thing, as men imagine, but a hard thing to treat familiar subjects with originality: you yourself, Piso, have also preferred this, the better and harder course, in drawing the plot of your tragedy from Homer. The choice is worthy of your powers. But you must see that this *fabula communis* is treated *proprie*, and to this end you must avoid the following three faults . . .'

The Piso here addressed was writing a tragedy on some Homeric subject after the fashion of the day. This is shown by the form *deducis* in contrast to *proferres*, and confirmed by the disproportionate scale of the treatment of the drama in this epistle. By the emphatic *tuque* 'you as well' Horace affects to fortify his own theory by the practice of Piso, and indirectly conveys, not a depreciation, but an appreciation of his judgment, ability, and ambition.

Horace seems to have in mind Aristotle's *Poetics* c. 14, where it is said that the tragic poet usually, though not necessarily, draws his plots from the well known histories of a few mythical families which afford the fitting Recognitions and Catastrophes, keeping the names and traditional characters of the personages, but that none

the less he should display invention of his own in the artistic treatment of this material. αὐτὸν δὲ εὐρίσκειν δεῖ καὶ τοῖς προδεδομένοις μύθοις χρῆσθαι καλῶς.

It is of course impossible to delete altogether with Ribbeck vv. 240-3, some of the best and most Horatian lines in Horace. But they would be much better away from their present context, where they strangely interrupt a discussion of the style of the Satyr drama, *Silenus* v. 239 evidently referring to the *Cyclops* of Euripides and *Fauni* v. 244 to the Satyr chorus. Editors who retain them have to apply a little gentle violence to make them refer to the style of the Satyr play: but the expressions which are most refractory in this view *ex noto fictum carmen sequar*, and *de medio sumptis*, are just those which are most effective in the proposed context, the first stating Horace's preference for the usual course *famam sequi* (hence *sequar*), and the second anticipatory and clearing up the meaning of *communis*.

The above interpretation is not dependent on the proposed transference though less obvious without it. But if such transference solves two *crucis* at once and makes both contexts quite clear and smooth, it seems worth consideration in the case of a writer so deliberate and fastidious, so careful

ut iam nunc dicat iam nunc debentia dici.

H. J. MAIDMENT.

AD APULEIUM.

Met. iv. c. 23, p. 85, 14 v. d. Vliet (Teubner, 1897):

'nec mora cum latrones ultra <solitum> anxii atque solliciti remeant, nullam quidem prorsus sarcinam vel omnino licet vilem laciniam ferentes sed tantum <totis> gladiis, totis manibus, immo factionis suae cunctis viribus unicum virginem filo liberalem—advehebant.'

'totis' addidit v. d. Vliet: ego in 'tantum' (tantū) latere puto 'tantis' i.e. 'tot,' cf. p. 125. 12 'tantorum seminum,' p. 67. 4 'rerum tantarum.' -if pro compendio -ū legebatur. Simili errore p. 56. 9 in F 'nonen' scriptum est pro 'non enim' (non eni).

Met. vi. c. 16, p. 129. 20:

'iam tu quidem maga videris quaedam mihi et alta prorsus malefica.'

Exemplorum copia docent viri docti verba 'magus et maleficus' (vel: veneficus) sic iungi solere, cf. etiam Apul. *Apol.* c. 78 (p. 96, 6, v. d. Vl.). Inde est quod nulla quantum scio editio est post Oudendorpianam quae non spreto *Codicis* F auctoritate, *Codicis* φ lectionem 'maga' exhibeat. Et tamen illius fidem satis firmiter stabilitam puto. Quod aliud est verborum artissima coniunctio, aliud eorumdem interruptus tenor, ut levius fortasse argumentum omitto: sed notandum est pronomen 'quaedam' suas proprias partes hic agere, ut addito adiectivo

'magna' vim substantivi nominis efficiat (p. 218. 16 quidam procerus, p. 240. 22 vilis aliqua, p. 191. 19 cuiusdam pauperis), potentemque illam magiae artem tecte indicari, sicut p. 62. 15, ubi Pamphile (maga) magnis suis artibus reformari dicitur: fuere qui et illic 'magicis' rescriberent (coll. p. 67. 25 artis magicae), inter eos v. d. Vliet, haud aequae facilem illic errorem librario imputantes atque hic in vocibus 'magna-maga.' Conferantur quae in Actis Apostolorum de Simone mago scripta sunt 8. 9, 10: 'ἀνὴρ δὲ τις ὀνόματι Σίμων προὔπῃρχεν ἐν τῇ πόλει μαγέων καὶ ἐξιστάνων τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναι τινὰ ἐαυτὸν μέγαν, ὃ προσείχον πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου λέγοντες· Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη.'

Met. vi. c. 26, p. 137. 7 :

'nam et illa ipsa praeclara magia tua vultum laboresque tibi tantum asini < dedit >, verum corium non asini crassum sed hirundinis tenue membranulum circumdedit.'

Pro 'hirundinis' 'hominis' v. d. Vliet, 'hirundinis' antiquiorum nonnulli scripserunt. Remedium petendum est ex Plinio *H.N.* 16. 31 'Cortex quibusdam membranaceus, ut viti, harundini.'

Met. vii. c. 7, p. 147. 6 (Haemon latro in exilium cum uxore proficiscentem procuratorem principis, dum in taberna pernoctant, adgreditur) :

'invadimus et diripimus omnia nec tamen periculo levi temptati discessimus. simul namque primum sonum ianuae matrona percepit, procurrens in cubiculum clamoribus inquietis cuncta miscuit, milites suosque famulos nominatim sed et omnem viciniam suppetiatum convocans.'

Quis sibi persuadebit 'singularis pudicitiae feminam' (p. 146. 20) extra cubiculum noctem egisse vel redeuntem milites illic invenisse? Profecto aut 'cubiculo' scripsit Apuleius (p. 203. 16: 'procurrit cubiculo') aut, quod verisimilius est, 'in publicum' (p. 48. 5: 'civitas omnis in publicum effusa' (sic Gruter pro 'populum')). Procurrens = domo procurrens, cf. p. 138. 4 'virgo captiva—voeis exitu procurrens.'

Vitium inde ortum esse puto quod librarius aliquis propter impressionum confusionem, cum sonum saepius occurrentis litterae auri- bus memoriaque teneret, eandem litteram etiam alieno loco intrudebat, id quod in librorum transcriptione haud raro factum esse scimus, hodieque fieri experiuntur qui

typothetarum plagulas corrigere solent.¹ Sic aliquis per errorem scripserat 'procurrens in cubiculum clamoribus,' quod sequens librarius in 'cubiculum' corrigendum existimabat.

Met. vii. c. 18, p. 155. 12 :

'cum fluvium transcenderemus qui forte praeter viam defluebat, peronibus suis ab aquae madore consulens ipse quoque insuper lumbos meos insiliens residebat.'

Immo 'per viam' ut in montuosis regionibus fieri adsolet: et quid opus erat flumen transire iuxta viam defluens? Cf. Lucian. *Op.* p. 599 (c. 29) 'καὶ ποταμὸς ἦν ἀένας ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· ὁ δὲ τῶν ὑποδημάτων φειδόμενος ὀπίσω τῶν ξύλων ἐπ' ἐμοὶ καθίζων ἐπέρα τὸν ποταμόν.'

Met. vii. c. 19, p. 156. 13 (Asinus stupam ardentem tergo vehens leto proximus est) :

'iamque fomento tenui calescens et enutritus ignis surgebat in flammam et totum me funestus ardor invaserat nec ullum pestis extremae suffugium nec salutis aliquod apparet solacium et ustrina talis moras non sustinens [et] maturiora consilia praevertitur.'

Sic v. d. Vliet pro 'meliora.' Praetulerim 'pleniora,' coll. p. 225. 1 'et magnam domus cladem ratus indigere consilio pleniora—'

Met. vii. c. 21, p. 157. 7 (Asinum calumniatur mulio) :

'ut quemque enim viatorum prospexit sive illa scitula mulier sive virgo nubilis seu tener puellus, eos ilico disturbato gestamine, nonnunquam etiam ipsis stramentis abiectis, furens incurrit et homines amator talis appetit et humi prostratis illis inhians illicitas atque incognitas temptat libidines et ferinas voluptates aversa Venere invitat ad

¹ Huius communis fere hominum erroris exempla dedimus in *Class. Rev.* xviii. 1. p. 52, unde apparebat etiam sequentis alicuius syllabae vel litterae sonum, prioris impressionem saepe turbare: quod passus est ille qui scripsit ix. c. 36, p. 216. 3 'canes—transeuntium viatorum passibus morsibus alumnatos,' ubi non cum Colvio 'passivis' correctum velim sed 'passim,' sicuti Eyssenhardt edidit. Adverbia enim cum substantivis verbalibus quae vocantur ab Apuleio iungi solere, praeter cetera exempla docent iv. c. 1, p. 68. 9 'iamque nos (se. iumenta) omni sarcina levigatos in pratrum proximum passim libero pastui tradidere' = ut passim libere pascere; viii. c. 15, p. 174. 27 'lupos—nimia ferocitate saevientes, passim rapinis adsectos infestare cunctam illam regionem,' nisi quis maluerit torta interpretatione 'passim' aut ad 'saevientes referre aut ad 'infestare.' Dubium est iii. c. 3, p. 49. 18: 'iuvenem—passim caedibus operantem.'

nuptias. nam imaginem etiam savii mentiendo ore improbo compulsat ac morsitat.'

Bursian addit <et> post 'voluptates,' Rohde corrigit 'voluptarius,' v. d. Vliet transponit post 'illicitas.' Ego post 'ferinas' insero <instruens> coll. p. 235. 20 'et quo se patrono commendationem faceret, studiosissime voluptates eius per meas argutias instruebat,' p. 275. 7 'si quam rem voluptati struendae moliris,' p. 154. 18 'aliam mihi denuo pestem instruxit,' p. 77. 28 'publicas voluptates instruebat.'

Met. vii. c. 23, p. 158. 13:

'nefas,' ait 'tam bellum asinum sic enecare et propter luxuriam lasciviamque amatoriam criminatum opera servitioque tam necessario carere.'

Graviore remedio usus v. d. Vliet ita rescripsit: 'et propter luxuriam lasciviamque, amatoriam crimina, tam <utili> opera servitioque tam necessario carere,' cum lucidus ordo restitui possit, si verba 'sic enecare et' transponas post 'criminatum.'

Met. viii. c. 10, p. 171. 7:

'Nec isto sermone Thrasyllus sobrius factus vel saltem tempestiva pollicitatione recreatus identidem pergit linguae lactantis susurros improbos inurgere.'

Ad Codicum F et ϕ scripturam 'linguae satiati' (quod tamen in F inductum est) propius accedit aut 'lingua satianti,' aut quod Colvius coniecit 'linguae satiantis.' Neque id a re alienum: Thrasylli instantia taedium affert Charitae ut quae totam huius machinationem iam diu perspexerit. Cf. p. 101. 12 'haec autem novissima quam fetu satiante postremus partus effudit—' De abl. in -i cf. p. 194. 21 'stagnanti.'

Met. viii. c. 23, p. 180. 25:

'—civitatem quandam populosam et nobilem iam fessi pervenimus. inibi larem sedesque perpetuas pastores illi statuere decernunt quod et longe quaesituris <nullae magis> firmae latebrae <fore> viderentur et annonae copiosae beata celebritas invitabat.'

Falsa, ut opinor, interpretandi ratione ductus v. d. Vliet—is enim 'longe' cum 'quaesituris' iungebat—verbis supplendis ambiguitatem tollere conatus est; nam dubium videbatur utri quaesituri essent, illine qui pastores utpote servos fugitivos indagarent an ipsi fugitivi novas sedes petentes. Sed notandus est usus ille Apuleianus, quo 'longe' (= valde, cf. p. 25. 25 'tibi longe provisum cupio') gradu positivo adiungitur ut efficiatur super-

latus (longe firmae = firmissimae), cf. p. 17. 15 'longe opulentus' et praecipue p. 103. 14 'longe firmiter': adverbium autem interposito nomine ab adiectivo suo separatum haud semel apud nostrum invenies.¹ 'Quaesituris' autem non potius esse participium puto quam substantivum inter alia plura ab Apuleio inventum neque absurdum videtur eum 'firmae' cum ablativo (= a quaesituris) iunxisse, si quidem stilo eius convenit, cf. p. 176. 29 'qua caveremus clade,' Flor. xiv. p. 164. 4. v. d. VI. 'ni—circumstans coronae obtutum magistri secreta defendisset.' Conferatur etiam Hist. Bell. Alexandr. i. 'Incendio tuta Alexandria.'

Met. viii. c. 14, p. 198. 18:

'fabulam denique bonam, prae ceteris suave comptam, ad aures vestras adferre decrevi.'

'Suavem compertu' edidit v. d. Vliet. Adverbio 'suave' (cf. p. 95. 12 'suave recubans') integro relicto, cum Colvio scripserim 'conditam,' sicuti in Flor. xx. p. 186. 16 'ego et alias crateras Athenis bibi: poeticae cōntam (F. 'cōntam' ϕ), geometriae limpida, musicae dulcem, dialecticae austerulam' Scioppius recte 'conditam' coniecit.

Met. viii. c. 22, p. 205. 11:

'revelatis luminibus libere iam cunctas facinorosa mulieris artes prospectare poteram.'

Lectionis 'libere iam' quae est in Juntina pro 'liber etiam,' quod in 'liber iam' mutat Rohde, suffragatur p. 54. 7 'risus libere iam exarsit in plebem.'

Met. viii. c. 37, p. 216. 20 (Fratres fratridum is a canibus dilaceratur, auxiliantur):

'obvolutisque lacinia laevis manibus lapidum crebris iactibus propugnare fratri atque abigere canes adgrediuntur.'

Qui scuto carent, brachium laevum vestimento tegere solere nota res est; sed quibus e minus contra canes pugnandum est neque inde ullum telum verendum, quid in illa re tutelae sit, non magis liquet quam

¹ p. 60. 21 'coram magiae noscendae,' p. 58. 21 'iam capillos absconditos,' p. 115. 16 'commodum Venerem lavantem,' p. 149. 10 'ex animo quidem meo sententiam conducibilem,' p. 148. 26 'arbitror latrones nihil anteferre lucro suo debere ac ne ipsam quidem saepe et aliis damnosam ultionem' (= ac saepe ne ipsam quidem ultionem, quamvis etiam damnum afferat aliis); in locis qui leguntur p. 59. 13 'ignorabiliter lamminis litteratis,' p. 66. 8 'temere fascem lignorum positum' verborum ordinem mutavit v. d. Vliet, idemque fecit Luetjohann p. 37. 12 'probe calicibus ecfriticis,' nescio quo iure.

quomodo non augeatur salutis periculum fratri sub ipsis canibus iacenti, dum lapides in canes iaciuntur. Corrige 'ictibus': comminus enim fratres cum canibus proeliantur, idque faciunt quod c. 40 hortulanus facit qui militem 'sublime elatum terrae graviter applodit et statim de via lapide correpto totam faciem manusque eius et latera converberat.'

Mox unus e fratribus inermis impetum facit in armatum iuvenem qui canes illos incitaret et (c. 38, p. 217. 26)

'complexu fortissimo arripit eius dexteram magnoque nisu ferro liberato multis et crebris ictibus impuram elidit divitis animam.'

Iniuria v. d. Vliet 'librato' edidit: 'nisus' enim non est 'impetus' sed 'raptus,' ut p. 137. 19 'et alacri statim nisu lorum quo fueram destinatus abrupto.'

Met. xi. c. 30, p. 276. 19:

'instructum teletae comparo largitus, ex studio pietatis magis quam mensura rerum < meorum impendiis > collatis.'

Adverbium 'largitus' recte vindicat v. d. Vliet: in sequentibus autem quae in F ita scripta sunt:

mensura λ colatis

in ϕ : insura λ cjlatis

solus Kaibel emendandi viam indicasse videtur dum scribit 'quam mensura commoditatis'; sic et $\delta\mu\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ (pietatis—commoditatis) restituitur et utraque pars sententiae aequabili pondere procedit: sed praetulerim 'mensura facultatis' hoc est 'facultat' (cf. Ital. *facoltà*). Litterae f et r (mensurarum) in scriptura longobardica fere sunt similes; de singulari numero cf. *de Plat. dogm.* c. 4, p. 84. 1, Goldb: 'avaritia atque lascivia, quarum altera liberalitatem coercescit, altera immoderatus fundendo patrimonium prodigit facultatem.'

Apol. c. 22, p. 30. 23 v. d. Vliet (Teubner 1900):

(Ad vitae usum pera et baculo contentum esse verum philosophum cum Cratete sentit Apuleius, citatque illius:)

' $\pi\eta\rho\eta\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\ \omicron\iota\omega\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\phi\omega$ ' (tum continuo ad accusatorem suum pergīt:)

'<omitto> iam cetera tam magnifica, quae si tu legisses, magis mihi peram quam nuptias Pudentillae invidisses.'

Omitto quod ex litteris $\tau\omega\upsilon\tau\omega$, quae in MS. post $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\phi\omega$ leguntur, eruit Jahn, exulet; in litteris enim illis nihil latere nisi

NO. CLXIV. VOL. XVIII.

' $\Pi\omicron\tau\omega$ '—initio versus Κρήτη in *Cod.* extat pro $\pi\eta\rho\eta$, conflatis scilicet Homeri et Cratetis versibus—vidit Spengel (*Rhein. Mus.* N.F. xvi. p. 28). Animadvertas etiam velim, sicuti, hoc loco $\tau\omega(\text{NT}\omega)$ ex $\Pi\omicron(\text{NT}\omega)$ corruptum est, contra p. 100. 28 ($\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$) $\Pi\omicron$ esse scriptum pro ($\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$) $\tau\omega$. Neque in verbis 'iam cetera e. q. s.' quidquam desideratur: per 'iam' transitio indicatur ut *Met.* p. 254. 18 'iam gestamina longe diversa,' p. 96. 3 'iam ceterae partes,' *Apol.* p. 37. 21 'iam et illa similia'; 'tam' autem significat 'aeque,' ut *Apol.* p. 16. 8 'nam cetera omnia, credo quia tam lepida non erant, igni deussit.'

Apol. c. 24, p. 32. 16:

'De patria mea vero, quod eam sitam Numidia et Gaetuliae in ipso confinio meis scriptis ostendi dicis—non, video quid mihi sit in ea repudendum.'

'Ita v. d. Vl. ex Kruegeri coniectura; in MSS. est 'ostendi scis.' Cum autem Apuleius non Aemilianum solum sed et ceteros calumniatores alloquatur (c. 22 'cum ad contumeliam diceretis,' c. 25 'nonne vos pudum est'), corrigendum est 'ostendistis.' Recte se habet tempus perfectum: rem enim non diffitetur Apuleius.

Apol. c. 41, p. 54. 18:

'Nunc praeterea vide quam ipsi sese revincant. aiunt mulierem magicis artibus, marinis illecebris, a me petitam eo in tempore, quo me non negabunt in Gaetuliae mediterraneis montibus fuisse, ubi pisces p deucalionis diluvia repperiuntur.'

v. d. Vliet edidit: '—post D.d. <non> repperiuntur,' Ellis (*Class. Rev.* xv. p. 48) supplet '<via> repperiuntur' (where D.'s flood will hardly permit fish to be found), suspicatus etiam in 'per' latere posse 'super.' Faciliore remedio utendum puto et rescribendum 'repperiuntur' ($\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$); 'per Deucalionis diluvia' idem est quod 'Deucalionis temporibus,' cf. *Met.* p. 241. 1 'per absentiam mariti' (ubi nemini de Beroaldi emendatione pro 'prae abstinencia mariti' dubium esse confido).

Apol. c. 63, p. 79. 18 (Ligneo Mercuriolo, quem summa religione colebat Apuleius, Aemilianus accusator nomen 'sceletum' invenerat):

'em vobis, quem scelestus ille sceletum nominabat.'

Quod aptius convicium quam id quod *Cod.* F servavit 'sceletus ille' iaci poterat in illum

G G

qui alibi 'Charon' audit (p. 72. 6), alibi 'capularis senex' (p. 84. 4)? Cf. etiam p. 80. 10 'hunc denique qui larvam putat, ipse est larvans,' p. 80. 17 'sepulcrorum tericulamenta, a quibus aevo et merito haud longe abes,' p. 24. 6 'mirare tot in facie tua sulcos rugarum.'

Apol. c. 64, p. 80. 21:

'quin altitudinis studio secta ista (Platonica) etiam caelo ipso sublimiora quaeprim vestigavit et in extimo mundi *tergoretit*.'

v. d. Vliet 'tergo retexit,' Spengel 'restitit' (Plato *Phaedr.* 247 c: ἐστῆσαν ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ νόρῳ), rectius Ellis (*Class. Rev.* xv. p. 48) 'stetit'; cf. *Apul.* in libro de *Plat. et eius dogm.* c. 10, p. 72. 3 Goldb.: 'si hic olim chorus antiquus (sc. caelestium siderum) steterit.'

Apol. c. 84, p. 102. 5 (In epistula ad filium scripta, ipsa Pudentilla negaverat se ab Apuleio magicis artibus in ipsius amorem esse inductam):

'Εγὼ οὐτε μεμάγεμαι οὐτ' ἐρῶ τὴν εἰμαρμένην ἐκφ.'

Litteras ἐκφ. varie explent viri docti. Cum autem *Ap.* subnectat:

'reclamat vobis Pudentilla et sanitatem suam a vestris calumniis quodam praeconio vindicat, nubendi autem seu rationem seu necessitatem fato adscribit'

unde apparet Pudentillam magiam quidem negare, nubendi autem voluntatem confiteri sed fato tribuere, verba graeca sic interpretor: 'Ego neque incantata sum, neque praeter fatum amo'¹ et suppleo 'τὴν εἰμαρμένην ἐκφ. εὐχόνοσα', coll. *Plat. Gorg.* 512E: πιστεύσαντα ταῖς γυναῖξιν, ὅτι τὴν εἰμαρμένην οὐδ' ἂν εἰς ἐκφύγοι.

Apol. c. 90, p. 109. 9:

'atque ego scio, plerosque reos—hoc uno se abunde defendisse, vitam suam procul ab huiusmodi sceleribus abhorrere—; haec ego quamquam possim merito dicere, tamen vobis condono.'

Scaligeri coniecturam 'atqui' non debuit recipere v. d. Vliet: verba 'atque ego scio' significant 'scio quidem'—sed his argumentis utinolo (= haec ego quamquam possim dicere), cf. c. 56, p. 71. 17 'Atque ego scio, nonnullos et cum primis Aemilianum—res divinas deridere.—sed (p. 72. 12)

¹ Odiosum amoris nomen, ab adversariis inventum, per ironiam adservat Pudentilla.

ego, quid de me Mezentius sentiat, manum non vorterim.' *Nep. Epam.* 2. 3.²

Apol. c. 102, p. 124. 10 (Respondet Apuleius Aemiliano qui eum criminatus erat quod veneficiis (i.e. magicis incantationibus) in amorem Pudentillae viduae se insinuavisset, ut per eius nuptias divitior evaderet filiorumque rem familiarem interverteret, demonstratque in omnibus rebus se privignorum potius quam suis commodis prospexisse):

'o grave veneficium dicam, an ingratum beneficium?'

In his ut interpretationi sufficientibus nihil muto, quamquam ego equidem non dubito quin Apuleius, figurarum quae vocantur studiosissimus concinnator, per oxymoron simul et antithesin scripserit: 'o gratum (sc. privignis) veneficium—'

Florid. xvi. p. 170. 15 v. d. Vliet (Philemonem in theatro dum frustra expectant homines, missi sunt qui accirent):

'atque eum in suo sibi lectulo mortuum offendunt, commodum ille anima edita obriguerat, iacebatque incumbens toro, similis cogitanti: adhuc manus volumini implexa, adhuc os recto libro impressus; sed enim animae vacuus, libri oblitus et auditorii securus.'

'lecto libro' e Colvii coniectura ediderunt Krueger et v. d. Vliet. Non ita diu est cum nescio qui vir doctus codicum scripturam ita, si recte recorder, interpretaretur quasi poeta, dum manu caveret ne liber evolutus ('rectus') sponte rursus revolveretur, legens esset mortuus pronusque super librum corruens facie eum contextisset. Cum autem nemo librum dum legit ore tangat vel premat, fieri non potest ut qui ita procumbat speciem legentis nedum cogitantis praebeat, nec non aegre con-

² Sic et alibi mutavit editor, quod auctoris usus ut integrum vindicat, velut *Apol.* c. 45, p. 59. 3 'postremo quid vis?' (= p. 98. 5), ubi 'quid vis?' 'transposuit v. d. Vl.'; c. 18, p. 26. 14 'haec flagitia divitiarum alumni solent' (cf. *Met.* vi. c. 9, p. 124. 10 'cachinnum extollit qualem solent furenter irati'), ubi v. d. Vl. '<esse> solent' edidit: huius verbi (soleo aliquid) passiva forma est participium 'suetus' (*Ap.* c. 3, p. 6. 13 'multa in me proprie conficta et alia communiter in philosophos sueta ab imperitis'); *Ap.* c. 61, p. 78. 8 'qui mihi factum volebat' (= de *Plat. dogm.* p. 91. 18 Goldb. 'studere illis factumque velle'), quod per '<gratum> factum' supplevit v. d. Vl., prave autem interpretans defendit Ellis (*Class. Rev.* xv. p. 48) [vide Casaub. in edit. Oudond. ii. p. 532]; *Apol.* c. 103 p. 125. 19 'dotalas <tabulas> accipe, donationem recordare, testamentum lege,' ubi <tabulas> quod addidit v. d. Vl. removendum est, ut s'et promisso Apuleius, binis verbis se responsurum (vs. 14).

cedetur una manu duas voluminis partes dextra laevaue distineri posse. Verum ita res se habet: librum ille ad perpendicularum (rectum) manu tenebat, convolutum, sed digito illic inserto ubi inter legendum substiterat, mox continuaturus; ima pars voluminis nititur lectulo, idque eius brachii manu tenetur in quod procumbit poeta; summam, dum cogitat, ore premit, non facie dico sed ipso ore, sicut homo ille cogitabundus quem Rodin sculptor Gallus confecit, os manu inversa fulcit. Ita dum moritur, gravationis leges habitum hominis servant.

De deo Socrat. c. 6, p. 11. 5 Goldb. (= p. 10. 3 Luetj.):

'per hos eosdem (i.e. daemones), ut Plato in Symposio autumat, cuncta denuntiata et magorum varia miracula omnesque praesagiorum species reguntur.'

Intercidisse <vatum>, quod ante 'cuncta' insero, tam genetivi sequentes 'magorum' et 'praesagiorum' indicant, quam verba Platonis in *Symp.* 202 E: διὰ τούτων καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ πᾶσα χωρεῖ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων τέχνη τῶν τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰς τελετὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπωδὰς καὶ τὴν μαγανείαν πᾶσαν καὶ γοητείαν.

De deo Socr. c. 11, p. 14. 14 Goldb. (= p. 12. 22 Luetj.):

'quod si nubes sublime volitant, quibus omnis et exortus est terrenus et retro defluxus in terras, quid tandem censes daemonum corpora, quae sunt concreta multo tanto subtilior...? non enim ex hac faeculenta nubecula tumida caligine conglobata, sicut nubium genus est, sed ex illo purissimo aeris liquido et sereno elemento coalita eoque nemini hominum temere visibilia e. q. s.'

Ultima verba emendasse videtur Luetjohann scribens 'non enim ex hac faeculentae nubeculae fumida caligine,' quamquam etiam in sequentibus 'purissimi' correctum velim. De 'non enim' cum adiectivo vel participio cf. *Met.* p. 56. 9 'non enim laeta facie,' p. 204. 9 'non enim deterritus.'

In verbis 'quae sunt concreta multo tanto subtilior'—ubi de codicum vera scriptura 'multo tanta' dubium esse iam non potest, cf. Leo in *Archiv für lat. Lexic.* xii. p. 99—

lacunam quam statuit Goldbacher una littera supplevit Luetjohann 'subtiliora' scribens; 'concreta' enim pro substantivo adhibitum putat ut supra § 34 'corporum texta.' Cum autem in illo exemplo propter substantivum in casu genetivo additum nihil sit subsidii, correxerim: 'quae sunt concretio multa tanta subtilior,' coll. c. 15, p. 18. 9 (= p. 15. 19 Luetj.) 'corpus atque animum duobus nominibus comprehendentes, quorum communio et copulatio sumus.'

De Platone et eius dogm. ii. c. 22, p. 97, 10 Goldb.:

'sapientia amatorem boni adolescentem facit, sed eum, qui probitate ingenii sit ad artes bonas promptior. nec deformitas corporis talem abigere poterit adpetitum, nam cum ipsa anima complacita est, homo totus adamatur: eum corpus expetitur, pars eius deterior est cordi. iure igitur putandum est eum, qui sit gnarus bonorum, cupitorem quoque eiusmodi rerum esse; is enim solus bonis desideriis accenditur, qui bonum illud oculis animi videt [hoc esse sapientem]. † istud vero quoniam est ignarus, osor quoque nec amicus virtutum sit necesse est.'

Quod inclusit Wower, qui tamen in suo libro legebat 'hoc est esse sapientem,' Goldbacher emendare conabatur scribebatque 'hoc est sapientem,' suspicatus etiam—quod erat consequens—pro 'illud' legendum esse 'illum.' Sed per 'bonum illud' significatur id cuius, ut supra scriptum est, 'amatorem sapientia adolescentem facit,' et verba 'qui bonum illud oculis animi videt' spectant ad Plat. *Phaed.* 65 D: "Ἦδη οὖν πῶποτε τι τῶν τοιούτων (sc. τῶν δικαίων καὶ καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν) τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδες; Interpolationem profectam esse puto ab aliquo qui nesciret quid esset bonum illud.

Ea quae sequuntur, ubi Goldb. temptabat 'iste vero qui boni (vel bonorum) est ignarus' sic lego:

'istudiosus vero e. q. s.' Idem adiectivum—sed addita negatione—est in *Apol.* p. 52. 7 'medicinae neque instudiosus neque imperitus.'

A. J. KRONENBERG.

Rotterdam.

NOTES ON THE EMPHATIC NEUTER.

SEVERAL years ago certain idiomatic uses of Latin neuters attracted the writer's attention and examples began to accumulate. A somewhat careful search in the meantime has failed to discover any published discussion of these neuters, or any mention of them in the grammars or the handbooks of Latin style. It is hoped therefore that the following observations may not be without interest.

It is so common in English to emphasize by saying 'Nothing could be finer, more agreeable,' or the like, that it is easy to overlook a striking peculiarity of certain analogous Latin phrases. Pliny writes (*Letters* i. 22):

Nihil est enim illo gravius sanctius doctius, ut mihi non unus homo, sed litterae ipsae omnesque bonae artes in uno homine summum periculum adire videantur.

Now a *thing* may be *gravis* in the physical sense, it may even be *sanctus*, but it cannot be *doctus*. Pliny evidently means to say that no one in the circle of his acquaintance possessed in larger measure the dignity, uprightness, and range of culture which the best Romans admired in their noblest men. Why then does he not say just that? *Nemo* was the precise word, always available, always in good use, from Plautus to Suetonius. Could *nihil* have been a slip, or an intrusion of the resurgent *sermo plebeius*?

The range of this peculiar idiom is very wide. Its essence is the coupling with certain neuters, *nihil*, *quid*, etc., of epithets or statements which are strictly applicable only to intelligent and moral beings. Examples follow, which might be greatly extended:

Pl. *Men.* 620 Nihil hoc confidentius, qui quae vides ea pernegat.

Also 630, *Trin.* 199-202 and elsewhere.

Ter. *Adel.* 98 Homine imperito numquam quicquam iniustiust.

Also 366 (nil quicquam). *Hau. Tim.* 255 (quid).

Catullus 9. 11 Quid me laetius est beatiusve?

Cic. *Att.* 5. 1. 3 Nihil tam vidi mite, nihil tam placatum quam tum meus frater erat in sororem tuam. Also in sections 4 and 5 of the same letter.

Caes. *Att.* 9. 16. 3 Dolabella tuo nihil scito mihi esse iucundius.

Nepos, *Alcib.* 1 Constat enim . . . nihil

illo fuisse excellentius vel in vitiis vel in virtutibus.

Hor. *Sat.* i. 3. 18, 19 Nil fuit umquam sic impar sibi, that is, nobody was ever such a bundle of contradictions [as Tigellius]. Also *Odes* i. 12. 17, 18.

Martial i. 10 Adeone pulchra est [Maronilla]? Immo foedius nil est.

Juv. x. 278, 279 Quid illo cive tulisset | natura in terris, quid Roma beatius umquam?

These examples are without exception neuter or interrogative with a negative implication. *Quid*, *nihil* (*nil*), and *quicquam* are the prevailing neuters. In every instance *nemo*, *quis*, or *quisquam* would be the more precise word, and would correspond with good usage in English, where an imitation of the Latin would be not only incorrect, but often ludicrous or impertinent.

It will not be superfluous perhaps to dwell for a moment upon the distinctive meaning of these expressions. Demosthenes (*de Corona* 47) uses οὐδὲν like *nihil*, and three editions taken at random interpret in as many ways. One says the neuter indicates 'contempt'; the second makes it suggest the character rather than the man, the third finds in it simply emphasis.

For the Latin the third view is undoubtedly the correct one. If we frame an English expression like this: 'In peace no virtue so becomes a man as modest stillness and humility,' clearly we have said something much less forceful than Shakspeare's 'In peace there's *nothing* so becomes a man,' etc. So when Clitipho says to his friend (*Ter. Hau. Tim.*, 295, 296), *Si haec sunt, Clinia, | vera, ita ut credo, quis test fortuntior?* all seems natural and as forcible as English could make it. But Catullus (ix. 10, 11), exulting in the return of his long-absent friend, anticipating with keenest zest the renewal of social joys, throws logic to the winds and cries,

O quantum est hominum beatiorum,
quid me laetius est beatiusve?

That is to say, *no man, no woman, no rollicking boy at play, no hero reclining at a banquet of the gods, was ever more radiantly happy than I.*

Considering the evident fondness of the

Latin writers for this form of emphasis, it seems probable that whenever *nihil*, or a similar neuter, is used in a comparison with masculine or feminine nouns, the expression is more emphatic than the (apparently) parallel English forms. To us all sexless objects are alike neuter: to the Latin writers not so.

In his *Laelius* (50) Cicero says *nihil est enim appetentius similitum sui nec rapacius quam natura*. Is it not probable that the writer intended to cover all beings, natures, elements, animate and inanimate that could be conceived of as coveting their like? So Caesar writes to Cicero (*Att.* 9. 16), *nihil a me abesse longius crudelitate*. Is not this intentionally more sweeping than *nullum vitium* etc.? Cicero says (*Fam.* 15. 4. 4) *nec est quicquam Cilicia contra Syriam munitius*: this certainly is more sweeping, more emphatic, than if he had used *ulla provincia*, or *ulla regio*.

We turn now to certain neuters found in expressions not negative, where emphasis is secured in a slightly different way. While *nihil*, *quicquam*, and *quid* in questions implying a negative, emphasize by exclusion, *quicquid*, *quantum*, and *quid* in exclamations produce a similar effect by inclusion. Thus in Ter. *Hau. Tim.* 247, we have *portant quid rerum*! What a load of things! In 254, *dī boni, quid turbaest*! So in 255, *Andria* 745, and *Phor.* 853 (*quantum*).

Catullus is fond of this inclusive neuter. In 3. 1, 2 we find

Lugete, O Veneres Cupidinesque,
et quantum est hominum venustiorum.

Other examples occur in 9. 10 (already quoted), and in 31. 14. Compare the first two with Ter. *Phor.* 853. Horace has this use of *quicquid* in *Sat.* i. 6. 1, and *Epode* v. 1. Livy xxiii. 9. 3. *Iurantes per quicquid deorum est*. That is, by every god above, below. Cicero's *quicquid increpuerit, Catilinam timeri* (*in Cat.* i. 18) is like saying, At every rustle of man or mouse.

Typical examples illustrating the difference between the simple relative *quod* and the more inclusive *quicquid* may be taken from the *Andria*. In line 464, Mysis says, *nam quod peperisset iussit tolli* [*Pamphilus*]. That is, *be it male or female, he has promised to acknowledge it*. Earlier in the play Davus is expressing himself in a very different mood. He has no sympathy with his young master's feelings as a lover and prospective father, and besides he forebodes a flogging for himself. Hence he says (219) *quicquid peperisset decreverunt tollere. Be it*

male or female, sound or sickly, an infant Apollo or a monstrosity, they have decided to rear the brat. This fairly expresses Davus' mood, whether the poet distinctly thought of such a catalogue or not. The neuter indefinite is certainly broad enough to cover the amplest list of undesirables.

Tennyson has elegantly imitated this use of *quicquid* in his *In Memoriam* xviii. 'And come, whatever loves to weep.' And Henley wrote

'I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.'

If these two related uses of the Latin neuter deserve a name, they may perhaps be classed together with sufficient accuracy as *the emphatic neuter*, the one type emphasizing by exclusion and the other by inclusion.

When this usage is distinctly recognized, light is thrown on other expressions which at first seem inaccurate or clumsy. When Horace says (*Epist.* i. 9. 4), *legentis honesta Neronis*, the essential thought is that Tiberius chooses his friends from the ranks of honorable men; but the blanket-signification of the neuter makes the compliment much more telling. Livy (i. 53) makes the people of Gabii comfort 'the false Sextus' by assuring him *in se ipsum postremo saevitutum, si alia desint*. Not that Tarquin was given to venting his spite upon inanimate objects, but the neuter secures by the simplest means the utmost breadth of meaning.

In view of the range and frequency of these emphatic neuters, it may well be that in some passages, where the context does not absolutely require such an interpretation, the usage has been entirely overlooked. A possible instance is found in the *Adelphoe*, 125-127. Demea says with fine scorn, *Pater esse disce ab illis qui vere sciunt*. Micio replies, *Natura tu illi pater es, consiliis ego*. Demea retorts (Dziatzko's text) *Tun consiliis quicquam?* Understand *agis*, says Dziatzko. But why? If the omitted predicate can be taken from the preceding line with as good effect or even better, why should we bring in a new verb, even though it is one that is frequently omitted?

I understand Demea to mean 'Are you anything at all in judgment?' that is, when it comes to sound judgment, you are nobody, nothing. No wonder Micio replies, *Ah! si pergis, abiero*. For *quicquam* in predicate, instead of its more common use as subject, compare the *Tusculan Disputations* (i. 7. 14), *quid enim tam pugnat quam non modo miserum, sed omnino quicquam esse qui non sit?*

In the *Adelphoe* (264) we have the phrase *nil pote supra*, universally rendered, so far as the writer has observed, 'Nothing could be better,' or the like. This is a possible meaning of course. But Ctesipho is here exclaiming over the unselfish devotion of his brother. 'All his interests he has made second to my advantage. He has brought upon his own head the reproaches due to my *amour* and misdeed.' He concludes, *Nil pote supra*. Is not the natural climax this, 'No one could possibly do more'?

In the *Andria* (120) we have a similar phrase, *ut nil supra*. It seems more satisfactory, when careful account is taken of the context, to render in harmony with the usage illustrated above, and make the phrase equivalent to *ut numquam venustiore vultu quisquam fuerit*.

In the *Phormio* (208) Geta says *Hoc nil est, Phaedria. Illicet*. Possibly it is adequate to say, 'This is nonsense.' But Antipho's remark is true enough. The deficiency which disquiets the versatile Geta is in his young master's personality, not in his language. As a modern Geta might say, 'Antipho hasn't any *sand*.' Now if the emphatic neuter may properly be recognized here, the sense is certainly more satisfactory. '*Phaedria, this fellow's no good. Let's go.*' Such a use of *nil* would be parallel with that in the *Adelphoe*, 394, *Tu quantus quantu's nil nisi sapientia es*. If Syrus had been speaking in the same tone to Micio concerning Demea in the latter's presence, the Latin might have been, *Hoc, quantum quantumst, nil nisi sapientia est*.

For the present, one more instance must suffice. In his *De Finibus*, ii. 55, Cicero relates an interesting incident of a certain Sextilius, who secured a large legacy by a

falsehood of which he could not be convicted. Then follows *Num igitur eum postea censes anxio animo aut sollicito fuisse? Nihil minus contraque illa hereditate dives ob eamque rem laetus*. Reid translates 'Nothing could be less true.' But this again is dragging in a predicate in no way suggested by the foregoing words. *Dives* and *laetus* show clearly that the man, and not the statement is still in mind. The natural rendering, therefore, seems to be, 'No one was less so, but on the contrary he was enriched by that inheritance and happy for that reason.'

It should perhaps be added that this discussion lays no claim to completeness. After a sufficient number of examples were gathered to determine the nature and import of the usage, other questions demanded consideration, and therefore no author has been exhaustively studied with reference to these neuters, and some have not been examined at all.

Interesting queries are suggested. Is the usage essentially colloquial? Caesar uses it in letters, but apparently not in his narrative works. Cicero, on the other hand, employed it in most, if not all, of his most dignified works. Why is it rare in his orations? The *Milo* (ii. 5) contains the only example thus far noted by the writer. Yet it would seem to be precisely the sort of exaggeration suited to popular address. What does it signify if a writer absolutely avoids it, literary fastidiousness, or logical precision?

The writer at least, and perhaps Latinists in general, would be interested in a further discussion of these neuters.

JOHN GREENE.

Colgate University, N. Y.

THE LATIN FUTURE INFINITIVE

(*Crambe repetita*).

Quid Postgatius de origine Latini infinitivi et participii futuri activi senserit. Specimen literarium inaugurale quod—submittet JAN HENDRIK LEOPOLD Leovardensis die xvi mensis Aprilis anno mcmiv hora iii. Leovardiae—apud H. V. Bellium K.Z.N. mcmiv. Pp. vi, 78 (pp. 72-78 Theses).

I DISLIKE as much as most people plodding over the same ground twice; but when

positions which I have defended in eight pages¹ are assailed in seventy, I feel that I owe it to the eminent philologists who have accepted my views to take some notice of the attack. I do so with somewhat less reluctance as most readers of the *Classical Review* have, it is probable, never seen my longer paper.

Dr. Leopold (for I assume that the

¹ *Classical Review* v. (1891) p. 301, *Indogermanische Forschungen* iv. (1894) pp. 252-258.

dissertatio inauguralis which he courteously sent me was successful) has presented my views, with certain exceptions to which I shall refer below, in a form with which I have no fault to find; and from the ease and purity of his Latin style I should infer that upon a purely linguistic question his judgment is not unlikely to be sound. But unfortunately the issues here cannot be decided by a simple appeal to the evidence afforded by the extant literature or to Dr. Leopold's 'leges syntacticae linguae Latinae.' For any solution the aid of comparative grammar or 'historia grammatica' is indispensable. So that when Dr. Leopold denies 'the probability of my conjecture' and very frankly adds 'non is sum qui ex historia grammatica eam diiudicare possim,' I can console myself for my disappointment by the thought of the one-eyed man who complained of the stereoscope on the ground that what it showed him lacked solidity.

Before considering Dr. Leopold's argumentation, it should be said that a large part of his *dissertatio* consists of collections of references and quotations bearing on points raised directly or incidentally by my discussion, such as the substantives in *-tura* (pp. 15, 16), the omission of *sum*, etc. with the fut. part. in *-turus* (pp. 18-25), the occurrences of the future infinitive with and without *esse* in Plautus and Terence, with a table in which he brings out somewhat different totals from myself (pp. 33 *seqq.*) and that these collections will be of service to the student of Latin, whatever value be attached to the author's own conclusions.

In a matter so complicated as the present one, it is all-important that the chief issues should be clearly set out. They are:

A. The usage of the declinable future infinitive.

B. The origin of the declinable future infinitive in the indeclinable future infinitive.

C. The origin of the indeclinable future infinitive.

D. The origin of the periphrastic future participle.

A.—The usage of the Declinable Future Infinitive.

On the theory which Dr. Leopold champions that the declinable infinitive in *-tūrum* (*esse*), etc. is merely the future participle, we should expect its behaviour to be that of a future participle. But, as I showed in detail, it has, apart from declinability, of

which another account may be given, hardly a single mark of a participle. I take the points of difference *seriatim*.

1. The *non-insertion* of the substantive verb *esse*, which is *normal* in the *infinitive*,¹ of this supposed periphrasis by the future participle is *abnormal* in the *indicative* (and subjunctive) of the same periphrasis.

Dr. Leopold, traversing this statement, quotes to refute it twenty-nine passages of Plautus and Terence. Of this total, four belong to a class by themselves, as they are places where *sunt* (or *sint*) is omitted with the neuter plural nominative *future*. These are *Amph.* 1133, *Aul.* 432, *Bacch.* 510 and *Trin.* 209. Dr. Leopold deserves credit for collecting these examples which, except *Bacch.* 510 (where I noted that *futilia* had been conjectured) I had overlooked. Two again belong to a type which I expressly excluded (*Idg. F.* p. 256) '*victuri hostes* is very rare except of course when a verb can be at once supplied from the context' (my italics). One example is *Pers.* 378, A. '*Futura's dicto oboediens an non patri?*' B. '*Futura*' where, to speak exactly, the verb of 'being' is not left out, but carried on. The other is *Eun.* 463. Two more are *Stichus* 73 '*neque equidem id factura neque tu ut facias consilium dato*' ('equidem is factura' A, 'ego sum factura' the Palatine MSS) and *Men.* 119 '*nunc adeo ut facturus dicam*.'

The remaining twenty-one instances are such as *Mil.* 698 '*Quid? nutrici non missurus quidquam quae uernas alit?*' Dr. Leopold, flying in the face of the general opinion, refuses to admit that here we have aphæresis of the *e* in *es* and that *e.g. missurus* above is for *missuru's* or more strictly *missurus's*. He says that he does not understand

'*cur lectio codicum qui ad unum omnes "daturus," "venturus," "facturus" tradunt non servata sit. Si enim vocabulum "sum," ut supra vidimus, salva sententia omitti potest, multo facilius secunda persona "es" in colloquiis sceniciis ubi gestus sonus vultus ad intelligendum multum valent, abesse potest. Quare facio cum iis qui formas "daturus," "venturus" similia scribunt, quae lectio codicum auctoritate nititur.*' (p. 22)

I will leave Dr. Leopold's heresy to be dealt with by the editors of Plautus, and

¹ This observation, so far as I know, has not been disputed during the ten years that have elapsed since it was published and Dr. Leopold accepts it. His figures for the two dramatists are PLAUTUS 118 omissions 26 insertions. Total 144. TERENCE 56 omissions 18 insertions. Total 74. But for all this the grammars continue to mis-state the facts, *e.g.* the recent ones of West (1902), Allen and Greenough (1903) and Hale-Buck (1903).

only ask him these two questions. First, how is it that his ellipse is confined to the *masculine singular*? Does he not imagine that gesture, tone and expression are as effective when addressed to a female as to a male, to a multitude as to an individual? Secondly, how does he scan *Epid.* 284 'Tum tu igitur calide quidquid acturus age' or, in other words, how does he explain the fact that where the quantity of the final syllable of these forms can be tested it is long?¹

Dr. Leopold quotes from Plautus 134² examples of the periphrastic future and from Terence 35. It would thus appear that there are at most only 6 real cases of omission in the indicative and subjunctive (4 of these being with the one word *futura*) in a total of 169 or deducting the 2 cases of apparent omission in a total of 167. These figures should be compared with those for the future infinitive given under 2.

2. Another surprising feature in the behaviour of the declinable future infinitive is one that emerges when it is compared with the *periphrastic perfect infinitive* which is admittedly formed by *esse* with a participle.³

Dr. Leopold is not content with my simple statement (p. 255) '*Esse* is much less often absent with the perfect than the future,' and suggests that I ought to have counted the Plautine instances of the perfect infinitive, both with and without *esse*. As I did not, he has done it for me with the following result: I take his figures without question:

INFINITIVE	With <i>esse</i>	Without <i>esse</i>
Perfect	115	112 = 49 p.c.
Future	26	118 = 82 p.c.

I could not desire a more obliging opponent.

3. Another peculiarity of our infinitive is the *non-insertion* of its *subject*, as in Plautus, *Pseud.* 565 'neque sim facturus quod *facturum* dixeram,' where they say *me esse* is to be supplied. If *facturum* is really an infinitive,

¹ Dr. Leopold also denies the aphaeresis with the perfect participle and quotes, with similar unconsciousness of any difficulty, *Rud.* 871 'ut nanc̄ās habē.'

² This agrees well with my own enumeration, 128, as I excluded the examples from the Plautine prologues which are 4 according to Dr. Leopold.

³ Dr. Leopold gives a list of passages where the substantive verb is omitted with the perfect in finite moods. This is sheer superfluity and confuses the issue. The omission of the copula with the finite forms of the perfect would be relevant if we were considering its non-insertion in the perfect infinitive. But upon this there is no question.

tive, this is just as intelligible a construction as *Capt.* 193 'ad fratrem quo *ire* dixeram mox iuero' or its exact equivalent in Greek, εἶπον ποῖσέω. But if *facturum* is the accusative of a participle, it is as astonishing as 'laesum dixeram' for 'laesum me esse' would be. In order to make the omission possible we have to provide an infinitive, and if we provide it by the assumption that there is an omission of *esse*, we are met by the extremely awkward fact, a knowledge of which we owe to the fine observation of Krueger and of Madvig (on *Cic. Fin.* v. 31) that in this particular idiom the insertion of *esse* is the rarest of occurrences. Dr. Leopold does not deal with this argument, nor do I wonder.

4. A difficulty of another kind is presented by a rare but sufficiently attested construction. This is the one first found in Plautus *As.* 364 'quas—Diabulus ipsi *daturus dixit*,' then in Prop. ii. 6. 7 '*uisura* et quamvis numquam *speraret Vlixen*' and Apuleius *Met.* 7. 14 'quoad summos illi *promitterent honores habituri mihi*.'⁴ These constructions might with some little violence be forced to conform to the idiom of (3); and '*daturum*' and '*uisuram*' have been read. But this, as we both agree, is arbitrary. We agree, moreover, that they take their case from their principal subject '*Graecorum modo*.' The only question then is how did they arise. If we regard them as infinitives which have become declinable, they fall at once into line with the rest, corresponding to ἔφη δόσεω, ἤλπισεν ὀφείσθαι, ὑπέσχεοντο νεμεῖν. But Dr. Leopold says they are nominatives *with* infinitives

'nominativus enim cum infinitivo Graecorum modo a verbo sentiendi et declarandi pendens apud poetas Latinos et scriptores argenteae Latinitatis nonnumquam reperitur: Prop. II. 6. 7' c.g.s. (p. 38).

and having said this he proceeds to compare them with other constructions (nominatives with perfect infinitives he calls these) which are obvious imitations of Greek *participles* '*sensit medius delapsus in hostes*' *Aen.* 2. 377 ἦσθετο πεσών, *Aen.* 10. 500 '*gaudet potitus*, χαίρει τυχών, *Georg.* 2. 510 '*gaudent perfusi*, χαίρουσι βαινόμενοι, and *Ov. Met.* 9. 545 '*superata fateri cogor*, a construction which, though not wholly clear, seems to be an imitation of ὁμολογεῖν with the participle, that with the infinitive being

⁴ *Stat. Theb.* 7. 791 sq. which I formerly quoted does not belong here. Still less do *Virg. Aen.* 4. 519 '*moritura*' and *Stat. Theb.* 1. 347 '*uentura*' (quoted by Dr. Leopold) where the participle is an ordinary attribute.

unsuitable to the poet's needs. His remaining example 'sinit perterrita' deserves quotation in full 'at non caede uiri tanta perterrita (neuter plural) Lausus, pars ingens belli, sinit agmina' *Aen.* 10. 426.¹

Among imitations of participles should be placed Stat. *Theb.* 7. 791 sq. 'non aliter caeco nocturni turbine Cori | scit peritura ratis' οἶδεν ἀπολονμένη with a proper graccism: for I can find no Latin authority for the improper one assumed for scire by many commentators on Horace *carm.* 3. 27. 73 'uxor inuicti Iouis esse nescis.' φησὶν εἶναι justifies *ait esse* and the like. But οἶδα λέγειν is one thing and οἶδα λέγειν another.

B.—The origin of the Declinable Future Infinitive in the Indeclinable Future Infinitive.

Starting from the peculiarities in usage which have already been noticed, I contended that the future infinitive was not compounded from the future participle in -tūrus with *esse*; but that it was due to an attraction of an old indeclinable future infinitive in -tūrum vouched for by Gellius *Noct. Att.* i. 7, named an infinitive by him and compared by him in respect of function to the Greek infinitive: 'futurum [Cic. *Verr.* V. § 167] non refertur ad rem sicut legentibus temere et incuriose uidetur neque pro participio positum est set uerbum est indefinitum quod Graeci appellant ἀπαρ-έμφατον.'

Now this indeclinable future infinitive, found occasionally with *esse* but generally without it, is too well attested to be got rid of, though Dr. Leopold does what he can to whittle the evidence away. This evidence has been published more than once already. But as its amount and character are of prime importance to the inquiry, I subjoin from the *C.R.* the list of places in which this infinitive has been seen, marking with an asterisk the instances which Dr. Leopold (pp. 48-56) either doubts or disputes, and thus enabling the reader to form his own judgment upon each portion of the material without wrapping it in the dust of controversy.

Besides the locus classicus in Gellius already cited the construction is mentioned

¹ Dr. Leopold mistakes in supposing that I have passed over these constructions in silence ('quod Postgatus silentio praeterit' p. 38). For at the foot of the page from which he has just been quoting occurs this note 'If the pronoun be omitted' [with the Perf. Inf.] 'the only construction possible is the poetical graccism of Verg. *Aen.* 2. 377 'sensit medios delapsus in hostes.'

by Priscian ix. p. 864; and a large proportion of the passages given below come from these two grammarians.

A.—The Inf. in -tūrum. Plautus **Truc.* 400, *Cas.* *645, *664 (*occisurum*, A *occisuram* in both passages), Cato (ap. Prisc., Jordan p. 26, 7), C. Gracchus (ap. Gell.), *Lucilius ap. Prisc. = xvii. v. 8 (L. Mueller), id. xxx. vv. 107, 108, *C.I.L. i. 197 (lex reperta Bantiac) 18 (4 times), [*C.I.L. i. 198 (lex Acilia repetundarum) restored four times 36, 37 (bis), 44], Laberius in *Gemellis* (v. 51 Ribbeck), Quadrigarius in Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae* p. 222, ll. 1, 2 (= Gell. *l.c.*), id. *ib.* p. 232, 6 (= Gell. *l.c.*), Sallust **Jug.* 101. 4, *Varro *de re rust.* i. 68.

B. The Inf. in -tūrum contaminated with *esse*. C.I.L. i. *197 25, *198 45, *Sulla ap. Prisc. *l.c.*, Valerius Antias ap. Gell. *l.c.* 'dixerunt omnia . . . processurum esse.'

In addition to these there is the passage of Cic. *Verr.* V. § 167, which furnishes Gellius with a peg for his disquisition 'In oratione Ciceronis quinta in Verrem, libro spectatae fidei, Tironiana cura atque disciplina facto, scriptum fuit Homines tennes . . . neque apud ciues solum Romanos qui et sermonis et iuris et multarum rerum societate iuncti sunt fore se tutos arbitrantur: sed quocumque uenerint, hanc sibi rem praesidio sperant futurum.'

With this list before me I wrote (*Idg. F.* p. 254) 'Early Latin possessed also an *indeclinable fut. inf.*' Dr. Leopold prints the 'Early' in italics and comments as follows:

'non probare possum quod Postgatus contendit in sola prisca Latinitate hunc infinitivum indeclinabilem reperiri nisi forte Valerium Ant., Ciceronem, Sallustium, Varronem huic aetati attribuit.' (p. 56)

There is nothing to warrant the suggestion that I must regard these four writers as belonging to the age of 'prisca Latinitas.' There are such things in language as 'survivals'; and of the four writers Sallust is notorious for his archaisms, Valerius Antias was a contemporary of Sisenna who died in 67, Cicero wrote the passage in question (on which I purposely laid no stress because in Gellius' time its reading was disputed) not later than 69, and unless I deceive myself, there is intentional archaic quaintness in the last passage of all 'pensilia, ut uuae, mala et sorba ipsa ostendunt, quando ad usum oporteat promi quod colore mutato et contractu acinorum si non dempseris ad edendum ad abiciendum

descensurum se minitantur, Varr. *R. R. i.* 68. I think then that an unbiased reader will admit that this infinitive belonged to early, or if you like, earlier Latin and that it was practically extinct before the Augustan era and that he will not be surprised to learn that Priscian *l.c.* says it was often used by the *antiquissimi*.

But Dr. Leopold says it was used in every period of Latin literature:

'aut igitur negandum omnino infinitivum indeclinabilem fut. act. exstitisse aut concedendum usurpatum esse per omnia tempora litterarum Latinarum. Haec mihi sententia arridet.' (p. 57)

And on what grounds are we to make this generous concession? On the strength of one place in Gellius himself *Noct. Att. iii. 3. 1* (an obvious utilizing of his own discovery) and one place (will it be believed?) in Gregory of Tours as to which Dr. Leopold himself says that it is an imitation of Gellius (p. 57). This indeclinable infinitive Dr. Leopold sees clearly enough must somehow or other be brought into line with the declinable one; and the device by which he would effect this is the following: That, inasmuch as the form of the fut. act. inf. in *-um* and without *esse* was commoner than the rest of the forms, it was regarded as the true form and was subsequently used indeclinably. These are his words:

'Equidem censeo eius causam repetendam esse ex eo quod infinitivi fut. act. forma in *-um* desinens copula carens frequentior est quam cum copula iuncta: hanc formam igitur habitam pro vero infinitivo posteaque indeclinabiliter usurpatam esse: *dicturum eam* exempli causa iuniorem formam esse quam *dicturam eam*.' (p. 57)

'In fine superioris capitis statui indeclinabilem infinitivum futuri ortum esse o declinabili infinitivo cuius forma in *-um* cadens et numero praevalens causa fuerit cur scriptores Latini pro formis in *-am*, *-os*, *-as* desinentibus indeclinabiliter scripserint formam in *-um* exeuntem.' (p. 59)

By not one word does Dr. Leopold show that he has the faintest conception of the initial improbability of this hypothesis. To him it seems quite natural that the Romans, possessing a mode of forming the infinitive future, which showed the identity of the subject with the verbal predicate in gender and number, should have perversely substituted for it another mode that showed neither. It is as though the Greeks, while able to say and saying *οἶδα αὐτὸν ἐσομένον αὐτὴν ἐσομένην αὐτοῖς ἐσομένους αὐτὰς ἐσομένας*, had lumped these all together in congruences like *οἶδα αὐτὰς ἐσομένον*. But even this is to understate the case because the passage of Quadrigarius 'ii dum considerentur, hostium copias ibi occupatas futurum'

shows that we have to postulate a concord such as *ἦδε τὰς τῶν πολέμων ἱλὰς κατεληγμένας ἐσομένον*. When he has disposed of this, Dr. Leopold must not omit to explain how it comes that Terence's use of the future infinitive shows in general a freer declinability than that of Plautus (as I pointed out on p. 254) if the indeclinable form is later than the declinable.

I do not propose to repeat from *Idg. F.* p. 258 the parallels which I have adduced from Latin and elsewhere for the irrational attraction of one word by another and which Dr. Leopold has completely ignored. But I will add from German a striking instance of an infinitive assuming, just as in the present case, the declension of an adjective. The modern High German gerundive in 'ein zu verbessernder Fehler,' 'eine zu lobende Frau,' 'ein nachzunehmendes Beispiel,' is simply the Old and Middle High German inf., *anne* (O.H.G.) and *enne* (M.H.G.); e.g. 'das hūz ist ze sehenne' 'the house is to be seen' which has taken the position of an attribute and the inflexions of an adjective.

C.—Origin of the Indeclinable Future Infinitive.

This infinitive I explained as the fusion of a dative of a verbal stem in *-tu* + *es-om*, an old infinitive from the root *es* 'be' which by regular sound-change would appear as (*e*)*rum* in Latin. Thus *amātū-rum* would come from *amātū + erum* and mean 'to be for loving,' from which it is but a short step to the simple sense of futurity. This *erum*, or *esom*, is not otherwise attested for Latin but is found in the two nearest Italic languages Oscan where it is *ezom* and Umbrian where it is *erom*. Dr. Leopold objects that this sort of expression is well enough for English but that 'eiusmodi elocutio a lingua Latina aliena est.'

For Dr. Leopold the Latin language begins with Plautus. But if my explanation be right, these infinitives show a change of sound, *s* to *r*, which makes them at the least a hundred and fifty years older than that writer's earliest plays, and how much older, no one can possibly say. When therefore Dr. Leopold brings these four objections against my theory

- (1) 'infin. **erum* = **esum* ab omnibus formis inf., quae apud Romanos in usu fuerunt, magnopere differt;
- (2) supinum II in prisca Latinitate cum sola copula non solebat iungi;
- (3) si ita iunctum fuisset, significationem potius passivam quam activam habuisset;
- (4) in supino II cum verbo "esse" iuncto nulla vis futuri inest' (p. 11)

he is applying deductions drawn from a period of Latin of which he knows something to another period of which he knows nothing, and is thus unconsciously making an incursion into the territory of 'historia grammatica' without taking the most rudimentary precautions for his safety. Had he done so, by consulting, for example, Lindsay's *Latin Language*, p. 490, Brugmann's *Grundriss d. Vergl. Grammatik*, ii. § 899, or in fact any recent work upon the subject, he would easily have discovered that my mode of explaining the future infinitive is in principle identical with the accepted explanation of the future indicative, *sedē-bō*, *amā-bō* and the like being universally regarded as compounds of a verbal noun form (infinitive) with the present of the root to 'be,' *bheū*, Lat. *fu*; and that there is nothing shocking in the supposition that, just as the roots *es* and *fu* were combined in the paradigm of the substantive verb, so they were combined in the formation of the future tense. Though I am not here concerned with other uses of these suffixed auxiliaries, I may note in passing that the connexion of future and imperfect seen in *-bo*, *-bam*, is observable also in *fore*, *forem*.

As I have been dealing with derivatives of the verb *fu*, I may here refer to Dr. Leopold's chapter v. This concerns itself with *fore* and *futurum* and furnishes some useful information and statistics as to the relative frequency of the two infinitives. But its purpose is to suggest that the growth of the indeclinable use was assisted in this case by the commonness of the unchangeable *fore*. No one will blame Dr. Leopold for doing his best to make his view more probable, though personally I think this use of *fore* somewhat far-fetched, and I do not see why he did not invoke the help of all the infinitives in the Latin language. But I must protest when he writes

'sed secundum Postgatum forma infinitivi "*futurum (esse)*" antiquior est, ita ut expectes usum huius infinitivi frequentiore apud Plautum et Terentium fuisse quam infinitivi "*fore*": sed tabellae rem contrariam docent.' (p. 69)

Never in my waking moments have I held the view which the words that I have placed in italics attribute to me, and I can see nothing in the articles quoted by Dr. Leopold to warrant the statement.

To conclude this section, Dr. Leopold's general attitude is quaintly exhibited in the last words of his preface where he asks

'Denique unde Postgatus ipsum participium "*futurus*" vel potius inf. "*futurum esse*" ortum esse putat? Neque sine causa hoc roges quod

"*futurus*" antiquissimum participii futuri exemplum esse videtur. Num umquam supinum "*futu*" exstitit (my italics)?' (p. 12)

Audacious as it may be, I should reply that the infinitive *futurum* is to be explained in precisely the same way as the other similar infinitives and that *futu* did once indubitably exist. And now in turn I will ask Dr. Leopold a question 'Scis puto, uir bone, *absens* et *praesens*: num umquam *sens* exstitit?'

D.—The Origin of the Periphrastic Future Participle.

The origin of this participle seems, as it seemed to me in 1894, a matter for legitimate doubt. I felt the force of the consideration upon which Dr. Leopold lays very proper emphasis that in the time of Plautus it was already well developed; and this was why I introduced my suggested explanation with the words 'I have conjectured with the approval of Brugmann, *Grundr. l.c.* that the participle arose out of the declinable *fut. (inf.)* and I added that Kretschmer might be right in explaining it as formed by adding *-ro* to the 'verbal' stem *-tū*. Between these two possibilities I do not feel even now that it is possible finally to decide. For even approximate chronological data are absent. It is clear that at the time of Plautus the popular consciousness associated together the declinable infinitive and the periphrastic participle. This is shown for example by the passage I cited (p. 258) Plaut. *Pseud.* 565 'neque *sim facturum* quod *facturum* dixeram.' But just as we have refused to admit such association as proof that the infinitive came from the participle, so we must refuse to admit it as proof that the participle came from the infinitive. On the whole I now incline to believe that the participle is of independent origin. A participle in *-tūrus* could hardly fail to be connected with an infinitive in *-tūrum* and the declension of the infinitive would be very much facilitated. I lean the more to this view through observing what befel the German infinitive. This I state in the words of my friend, Dr. K. Breul whom I consulted upon this very subject. 'In the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries, in Middle and North German documents, a dissimilation of *-nn* to *-nd* took place and verbal forms such as *zō vindende*, *zō sehende* occur; e.g. *der helt is zō sehende* = *Der Held ist zu sehen*, in ordinary M.H.G. *der helt ist zō sehenne*. This *zō findende*, *zō sehende* was in later times confused with

and mistaken for the ordinary present participle and a transition took place from the original predicative use of 'daz buoch ist ze vindende (vindenne)' to the attributive: das zu findende Buch "the book to be found." In Latin confusion of the two verbals would be inevitable, seeing that they were now practically undistinguishable both in meaning and form.

This explanation lacks, it is true, the attractive simplicity of my earlier conjecture; but it makes the early fusion of the two verbals in the popular consciousness easier to understand. For it does not postulate any interval of time for the development of the participle out of the declinable infinitive.

I may be permitted to end with a brief résumé of conclusions.

In pre-historic Latin the future infinitive active was, like the other infinitives, indeclinable. It was a composite formation resembling future indicatives in Latin and other Indo-European languages. It differed in outward form from the periphrastic future

participle, as *captūsom* would differ from *captūrōs, ā, om.* When rhotacism attacked the Latin language, the future infinitive became identical in form with the acc. masculine and neuter of the participle. From this identity of form coupled with similarity of meaning grew up the idea that they were identical formations, and by consequence that the infinitive was an accusative of the participle, agreeing with its neuter or masculine subject. When this view was once firmly established, the infinitive was made declinable throughout, being conformed first to a feminine subject and later (probably) to a plural subject; and *esse* began to creep in. As this process, which naturally took some time to complete, went on, the old indeclinable future gradually fell out of use but lasted on in rare or isolated usage till the beginning, or the middle of the first century B.C., when it practically became extinct, though clear traces of the old usage remained in the constructions of the now declinable infinitive.

J. P. POSTGATE.

ON SECRECY IN VOTING IN THE ATHENIAN LAW-COURTS IN THE FIFTH CENTURY, B.C.

DURING the fourth century B.C. voting in the Athenian courts was regularly secret, the secrecy being secured by the use of two balloting urns (ὁ κύριος ἀμφορεύς, ὁ ἀκυρος ἀμφ.) and two slightly differing ballots. The character of the ballot determined the result of the vote. But in the fifth century this was indicated by the urn in which the ballot was deposited. For two urns were used as in the following century, but one was the urn of acquittal, the other the urn of condemnation; and they were distinguished from one another apparently simply by position. The urn of acquittal stood in front of the other. And instead of two ballots each juror received but one.¹

But how under these circumstances could a juror cast his ballot in secret? This, we are told, 'has not yet been ascertained.'²

¹ For the method in vogue in the fourth century see Aristotle, 'Αθ. Πολ. cols. 35, 36; Pollux viii. 123; Harpocr. τετραπηχέων; etc.

The evidence for the fifth century consists chiefly of the following literary references: Phrynichus, *Muses*, frg. 2 (Mein.); Arist. *Wasps*, 987 ff.; Aesch. *Agam.* 813 ff. (Weil); *Eum.* 674-753; Xen. *Hell.* I. vii. 9; Lysias xiii. 37.

² Gardner and Jevons, *Man. of Gk. Antiq.* p. 595.

Some even suppose that voting in the law-courts in the fifth century was not secret.³ It is true that in the *Wasps*, 987 ff., Philocleon does not conceal his vote, but it is essential to the burlesque that he should not. It is true also that in the *Eumenides*, 735, Athena declares her vote. But this proves nothing. That the votes of the others were secret is plainly shown by the suspense of Orestes and of the Furies, even while the ballots are being counted,⁴ l. 744 ff.:

ΩΡ. ὦ Φοῖβ' Ἀπολλων, πῶς ἄγὼν κριθήσεται;
κ.τ.λ.

This passage in the *Eumenides*, therefore, if

The suggestion of Lipsius (Meier-Schoemann-Lips., *Der att. Proc.* S. 940; see also Müller, *Eum.* S. 161) that each juror was given two ballots as in the fourth century was wholly without support and was rightly rejected by Thumser in Hermann's *Gr. Staatsall.*⁶ (1888) S. 551, by Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen* (1890), ii. 1, S. 371.

³ 'Die Entscheidung der Richter erfolgte...in den älteren Zeiten in öffentlicher, später regelmässig in geheimer Abstimmung.' Hermann-Thumser, S. 580; see also *Ann.* 5.

⁴ See Meier-Schoemann-Lips. S. 940, *Ann.* 497.

we admit it as evidence for the procedure in the ordinary law courts,¹ proves conclusively that secrecy was possible. The same is suggested by the passage in Lysias, xiii. 37, which describes the terrorizing methods of the thirty tyrants, who compelled the voters to cast their ballots not into urns, but openly (*φανερὰν*) on tables provided for this purpose; though not all scholars admit the last as valid evidence for the fifth century.

But how was this secrecy secured? The clue to the correct answer, I believe, Aeschylus himself furnishes us in the generally misunderstood passage, *Agam.* 813 ff. Agamemnon has just returned from Troy to Argos and his first words are an acknowledgment of the aid of heaven in his expedition against the city of Priam. 'For,' he continues, 'the Gods hearing the pleadings in the suit unspoken cast their death-laden ballots for Troy's undoing, with unwavering decision, in the urn of blood, while to the opposite urn mere hope of the hand drew nigh and it remained unfilled.'

δίκας γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ γλώσσης θεοὶ
κλύοντες ἀνδροβλήτας ἰλίον φθορὰς
εἰς αἵματηρόν τεύχος οὐ διχορροδῶς
ψήφους ἔθεντο· τῷ δ' ἐναντίω κῦται
ἐλπίς προσήει χειρὸς οὐ πληρουμένης.

¹ There is no evidence that the method of voting in the court of the Areopagus differed from that in vogue in the other courts in similar cases. The passage from the *Eum.* is admitted as evidence for the procedure in the other courts by Ross (*Arch. f. Philol. Suppl.* I. (1831), S. 355), Meier-Schoem.-Lips. (*Der alt. Proc.*², S. 937, 940), Hermann-Thumser (*Gr. Staatsalt.*⁶, S. 580), Gilbert (*Gr. Staatsalt.* i.², S. 432), etc.

The plural *τεύχεων* (l. 742) points to the use of two urns, one probably of acquittal, the other of condemnation, which was the arrangement familiar to Aesch. and his contemporaries (*Agam.* 815 f.). There is no reason, further, for doubting that each juror had but one ballot, though the Scholiast, l. 749, supposes that two ballots were used, a black one and a white one. This suggestion is adopted by Sidgwick, who adds that this was the commonest method at Athens. Black and white beans were used in drawing lots for public officials, but it is extremely doubtful if the use of black and white ballots ever obtained in Athenian courts (see Meier-Schoem.-Lips. S. 940, *Anm.* 487).

As a principle, secrecy in voting was familiar to the Athenians in the fifth century. Ostracism, established about 500 B.C., was by secret ballot. At the *διαδικασία* for admission to the phratry the Thiasitai voted secretly (*Demotionidai-inscr.* l. 77, quoted by Gilbert, *Gr. Staatsalt.*², S. 215). At the *διαψήφισις* conducted for the detection of illegally enrolled citizens the Deme-assembly voted secretly (Suidas: *διαψήφισις*). So the *ἐκκλησία* voted secretly when performing certain judicial functions: 'nur in Fällen die das persönliche Interesse Einzelnes betrafen' (Schoemann-Lipsius, *Gr. Alterth.* i. S. 411). It is, therefore, an entirely reasonable inference that voting in the law courts was likewise secret.

The reference here to the urns of acquittal and of condemnation is universally recognized; not so the significance of the last line. To the minds of many the words *ἐλπίς χειρὸς* are an expression 'from which no intelligible sense can be extracted' ² (Paley). Blomfield suggested that *χειρὸς* be construed with *πληρουμένης*, 'suffragiis manu datis non impleto.' Casaubon and Paley, imagining a reference to Pandora's box (*Hes., Op.* 96 f.), read *χεῖλος* for *χειρὸς*, which they suppose means 'in the opposite urn hope rose up to the rim.' Equally fanciful is Keck's *ἐλπίς προσήστ' ἀρχαίος*, 'bei den andern Urne sass nur die unnütze, kranke Hoffnung.' No more acceptable is Hermann's *ἐλπίς προσήει χραίος*, 'indiga.' *χειρὸς* is not a 'vox inutilis.' The reading of the MS., I believe, is sound, and means simply that in the fifth century, when two balloting urns were used and but one ballot, each juror, to insure the secrecy of his vote, placed his two hands simultaneously over the two urns and deposited his ballot thus in the one or the other without disclosing his vote. The suspense and the hope of the man on trial, as he observes each juror place his hand over the urn of acquittal as well as over that of condemnation, is most beautifully expressed by the poet: 'to the urn (of acquittal) hope of the hand drew near.' It calls to mind that other striking figure in the *Suppliants* of Aesch., 607 f.; when the Argive assembly voted by show of hands 'the air bristled with right hands.'

In the mysterious alembic of the poet's imagination even the commonplace act of balloting is transformed into one of marvellous beauty and significance. The poet's insight pierces to the inmost thoughts of the man whose fortune or whose life is at stake. How could his suspense and hope be more beautifully expressed? The 'hope' is not the hope or expectation of the urn for votes ('the other urn expected votes, but did not get them,' Sidgwick, Verrall, Schneidewin, first edition); nor does the 'hope' refer to the 'long postponement of the capture (of Troy) by the dissensions of Olympus' (Verrall). Neither is the choice between the reading of the MS. and the conjecture of Margoliouth, adopted by Weeklein, *ἐλπίς προσείει χείρας*, merely 'a question of taste' (Verrall). The judges did not 'wave' their hands before the urns; and Weeklein's reference to Eur. *H.F.* 1218, *τί μοι προσείων χείρα σημαίνει*

² Cf. Warr's trans. *Oresteia* (1900), p. 22, 'for her no hand but Fancy's fumbled in the void.'

φόνον; and the remainder of his note reveal a misconception of the passage. No more satisfactory is the comment of Dindorf (*Lex. Aesch.*): 'de spe loquitur tanquam de dea, ut Soph. *O.R.* 158.'

To deny a basis of fact to the words of l. 817 is to impair seriously the beauty of the metaphor. To have voted openly for condemnation would have brought only despair to the heart of the prisoner at the bar. But if the juror to conceal the nature of his vote placed a hand also over the urn of acquittal, that simple act was fraught with hope for the one on trial. His hope was centered in the hand. Grammatically, 'hope of the hand' is a periphrastic subject, like βίη Πριάμοιο, and equals 'the hope-laden hand.'

A somewhat similar interpretation was proposed many years ago by H. L. Ahrens, but it has evidently been overlooked by the writers on Greek legal antiquities, and it was unknown to me until I had prepared the entire preceding discussion. 'Sollte nun hierbei,' he wrote, 'das κρύβδην ψηφίζεσθαι . . . nicht vereitelt werden, so musste der Richter, während er in die eine Urne seinen Stimmstein wirklich warf, doch auch zu der andern treten und sich so stellen, als würde er auch in diese.'¹ The handbooks

¹ *Philologus*, Suppl. I. (1860), S. 566. The view entertained by Wilamowitz seems to be similar to that suggested by Ahrens:

'Stein auf Stein
in die Bluturne rollte, welche Troias Sturz

on Greek legal antiquities make no mention of this interpretation of Ahrens, nor have I found any reference to it in any of the editions of the *Agamemnon*, except in that of Keek (pub. 1863), where it is summarily dismissed. 'Die Institution des κρύβδην ψηφίζεσθαι,' he says, 'musste durch andere Einrichtungen als wie Ahrens sie sich denkt, gewährt sein, denn durch diese hätte sich Niemand täuschen lassen.' The central weakness in Ahrens' interpretation, which Keek rightly attacks, is avoided, I believe, in my own. Each juror if he cared to vote secretly, placed his hands simultaneously over the two urns, and not over first the one and then the other. The former method would be the more apt to insure secrecy. Moreover, I believe that the urns in the fifth century were identical in material, so that the click caused by the ψηφος was the same into whichever receptacle it was dropped. The fact, too, that the urns stood one in front of the other rendered detection more difficult. Finally, it is possible that the urns were placed at the back of the βήμα in the fifth century, whereas in the fourth century they stood in front on the βήμα (see *Wasps*, 347, 990; *Demos.* xix. 311; Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen*, ii. l. 371).

JAMES TURNER ALLEN.

University of California.

bezeichnete; zur andern trat zum Scheine nur mit leerer Hand der Richter. Klar ist der Entscheid.' *Gr. Trag.* ii. (1899), S. 78.

SOME NOTES UPON ROMAN BRITAIN.

(Continued from p. 399.)

IV.—THE BATAVI IN BRITAIN.

We know from Tacitus that up to 70 at least the Batavian auxilia were regularly sent to Britain, and that in fact eight 'cohortes Batavorum' were attached to the Legio XIV Gemina which was there in garrison. But in view of the disappearance of the legions which had sworn allegiance to the 'Imperium Galliarum,' there can be no doubt that these more guilty cohorts were disbanded after 70. Yet the tribe retained its former status in the empire; a new levy replaced the old, and crossed to Britain with Cerialis.

In his account of the Battle of Mons

Graupius Tacitus says 'Agricola...Batavorum cohortes ac Tungrorum duas cohortatus est.' The missing number has been variously supplied: 'quinque' say Ritter and Nipperdey, 'tres' Urlichs and Cichorius. But 'quattuor' is read by the new Codex Toletanus—the best MS. of the *Agricola*—and is to be accepted. Which were the four cohorts?

From inscriptions we know of Cohors I Batavorum miliaria pia fidelis, Cohors II Batavorum miliaria, Cohors III Batavorum miliaria equitata, Cohors IX Batavorum miliaria equitata, and another Cohors I Batavorum which was quingenaria. All the records belong to dates later than 70.

The first two cohorts are traceable in Pannonia from 98, the third in Raetia from 107; clearly they came to Britain, and returned to the continent, with the Legio II Adiutrix. As for Cohors IX, its number, as Cichorius says, shows that it belonged to the original series and was raised simultaneously with it. In the absence of other evidence we may assume from Tacitus that it served in Britain, though it did not belong to the Legio XIV; it survived 70, having taken no part in the rebellion. It is traceable only in Raetia, after the first century. But two inscriptions may be cited as possible evidence of its previous British sojourn. A fragment of tile recently found at Carlisle reads 'GVIII.' which Mr. Haverfield who published it explains as '[Le]g. VIII [Hispana]'. It may be at least equally possible to read 'CVIII' and the reference will then be to this cohort. An altar at Weissenburg (*C.I.L.* iii. 11918)—perhaps the earliest quarters of the cohort in Raetia—is inscribed 'Coh. IX Ba. eq. mil. EXPB.' The last letters are explained by Mommsen as 'Ex provincia Belgica.' But the Batavi were in Lower Germany, not in Belgica; in any case the tribe-name was sufficient indication of origin—the province was never added; while the garrison-province was often specified. Hence B = Britannia, almost certainly.

These, then, were the four cohorts at Mons Graupius—each a thousand strong. As for the remaining Cohors I Batavorum (quingenaria): it can be traced only in Britain, from 124 onwards. It may have been with Agricola, as Cichorius thinks: the reading 'quattuor' does not exclude the possibility that there was a fifth troop elsewhere in garrison. But it is more probable that this cohort, belonging to a distinct levy as its number shows, was raised and sent to Britain after the withdrawal of the other four cohorts by Domitian; there would scarcely be two Cohortes I Batavorum in the same province.

Besides the cohorts, there was one Ala Batavorum in Britain. Tacitus implies its presence at the attack on Mona by Agricola. Though 'cohortes equitatae' might possibly be alluded to, the description 'lectissimi auxiliarium' (since horsemen were more select troops than the footmen of the cohorts), the mention of horses, and the speed of the operations make an ala almost certain; the reference to skill in fording and swimming fits only the Batavi. The ala in question was of course not that which revolted in 69 (*Tac. H. iv.* 18) but the

Ala I Batavorum miliaria, which can be traced in Pannonia (*C.I.L.* iii. 11372) and then in Dacia in the second century. Like the three cohorts it was raised for service in Britain by Cerialis, and returned with them to the continent. Its presence at Mona would be an incidental confirmation of the view that the Legio II Adiutrix was then quartered at Deva.

The Cohortes I, II, and III miliariae may have taken the place of six 'quingenariae' in the original series, although the ninth was 'miliaria'; for though the auxilia in Britain (contrary to the general rule) probably outnumbered the legions, yet 8,000 foot with a proportion of alae would be too large a quota for one legion. If the disbanded ala was quingenaria, we have a total new levy by Cerialis of 4,000 men; inclusive of 1,000 old troops undisbanded, 5,000 in all, against at least 5,500 before 70. A decrease would not be surprising, because of the losses in the war; but even the decrease indicated was made good as we have seen before the end of the century.

V.—THE DATE OF AGRICOLA'S GOVERNORSHIP.

Most authorities agree in dating Agricola's command 78–85; only Asbach and Gsell argue for 77–84. The probabilities appear to be much in favour of the minority. It is true that Gsell's argument, that the British success whereby Titus won his 15th salutation as 'imperator' in the autumn of 79 (*Dio*, 66, 20; Chamblau, *de magistratibus Flavioorum*, p. 24) must have been in the third campaign, is not convincing; for Tacitus' narrative shows that the second campaign was at least equally successful, and indeed few years passed without at least one victory that was so signalised. But the chronological indications of Tacitus (*Agricola* 9, 18, 39), though vague, in each case more naturally support the earlier date. Why should Agricola's departure have been delayed by his daughter's marriage or by the ceremonial duties of the pontificate, rather than to complete his consulship, the one qualification he lacked? He had been selected at least by popular rumour months before. Can 'praepositus' imply designation only, and was delay in taking up the command usual? 'Media iam aestate transgressus' implies only that the government was usually transferred earlier in the year, as was probably the case with Cerialis and Frontinus; 'nuper' refers more usually to an interval of a few weeks than of a whole

year. It is admitted that the consulship was in 77; would not a man of Agricola's importance, with such a command in prospect, have followed immediately the imperial 'consules ordinarii' of the year, and have held office in May and June? With the other view, in order to shorten the interval before midsummer 78, the consulship is usually placed late in the year. Frontinus' command is thus lengthened a year beyond the usual 3-years' term, and as we have seen there was no emergency to make that probable. Liebenam was led by the corrupt text of Tacitus to suppose an unknown governor between Cerialis and Frontinus, and consequently to date the latter 76-78; and he is followed by the *Prosopographia*. But his view was never probable, and the Codex Toletanus is decisive against it. Mr. Furneaux says 'A strong argument against the earlier date is furnished by the episode of the Usipi, which would thus have to be placed in 82, a year too soon.' Now even if the Usipi were conquered only in 83, the shortness of the time occupied in their conquest, conscription, despatch to Britain, and escape would be very remarkable. The main portion at least of the Usipi were still north of the Ruhr and on the lower Rhine (cf. Furneaux on Tac. *Germ.* 32, 1, and his map). Their submission therefore had no connexion with the war of 83 in Upper Germany: rather were they subdued by Rutilius Gallicus at the end of Vespasian's reign (cf. III. *supra*, p. 399).

Lastly, the earlier date, as we shall see, suits better the changes of imperial policy with regard to Ireland.

VI.—THE INVASION OF IRELAND.

Without entering upon a full-length discussion of the vexed passage in the *Agricola*, the beginning of c. 24, a few points may here be noted. In c. 23, which must be read in close connexion, do not the words 'inventus in ipsa Britannia (in Britain proper) terminus' imply the completion of one task to prepare for the beginning of another? In the campaign of 79 the army had suffered much from stress of weather (c. 22, 1); the Romans had never been in such high latitudes before, and it might well have seemed that further advance into the barren Highlands was useless. The new emperor Titus saw a way to win for his reign a distinctive renown, and the conquest of Ireland was planned instead; to prepare for it the summer of 80 was spent in quiet consolidation, and the line of the Forth was

fortified as a permanent limit of the Empire.

Where, then, were the 'ignotae gentes' attacked in 81? Not beyond the 'terminus,' unless Tacitus is to contradict himself; and why should Agricola have gone by sea at all, when only a small circuit at most would have been necessary, and the new frontier forts would have furnished a ready base? Roman generals were no lovers of the sea. If we look for the tribes south of the 'terminus,' we are met by the words 'omnis propior sinus tenebatur' of c. 23; there were no unknown tribes there. Thus by process of exclusion we are forced to look for them in the North of Ireland. This view is further supported, as Professor Gudeman notes, by the transitional words 'in aliam insulam' at the end of c. 23—though Mr. Haverfield thinks the point too subtle—and by the presumption (for it is not an absolute rule, as Pfitzner would have it) that the 'que' in the second sentence of c. 24, where Hibernia is mentioned, implies a close connexion of thought and fact with the first. Thus the location of the 'ignotae gentes' becomes almost certain, even though Tacitus does not name Ireland. His carelessness can be paralleled even from the *Agricola*: in c. 7, 5 there is no mention of Britannia, where clearness would have required it; the reference becomes clear only from c. 8.

'Arma quidem ultra

Litora Iubernae promovimus et modo captas
Orcadas et minima contentos nocte Britan-
nos.'

So writes Juvenal; why should a sentence true to fact in two clauses be merely 'rhetorical' in a third? If Juvenal himself commanded the Cohors I Delmatarum at Uxellodunum in Cumberland, he would be well informed. As to that point, certainty is beyond our reach, as Mr. Duff says; but at least the difficulty raised by Cichorius is not conclusive. He argues that Juvenal could not have commanded in Britain since according to the inscription of Aquin he was trib(unus), and all the cohorts Delmatarum in Britain were quingenariae and under praefecti. But the reading 'trib.' in the Corpus is not so certain as to exclude the possibility of 'praef.' However that may be, in view of the way in which Juvenal couples the Orkneys and Ireland, Tacitus' record of the discovery and 'conquest' of the Orkneys, 'unknown up to that time' shows a remarkable resemblance in phrase to the sentence in dispute (*Ag.* 10, 5.) It is

natural to suppose that he also coupled the two 'conquests,' and that a similarity of circumstance suggested the echo in the language.

Agricola, therefore, in 81 made a tentative movement, a reconnaissance in force, to Ireland. But the death of Titus in September removed the chief supporter of the design. Domitian had not his father's or his brother's personal interest in Britain; and when the next year brought with it the fear of a rising of all Caledonia he had a ready pretext, if he was lukewarm, for deferring the Irish project.

The text of Tacitus may be corrupt; but the Codex Toletanus brings no new light. May we hope anything from the newly found Codex Auconensis?

ADDENDUM.

With regard to the inscription discussed in note I, parallel cases can be quoted, as Mr. Haverfield reminds me, of eastern officers in western legions at least after the early empire. If then, as he thinks possible, the inscription is to be dated about 200 A.D., the improbability of the attribution to Lindus is to that extent lessened; though western officers must always have been the rule in legions whose rank and file at least were almost exclusively western also. But

the improbability is increased in another direction. Rhodes, long decaying while the rest of Asia prospered, had suffered a final blow from which it never recovered—the great earthquake of 155 A.D. (Cf. Van Gelder, *Gesch. der Rhodier*, p. 174 ff.) The dependent town of Lindus was still less likely to produce a Marcus Minicius Martialis after that; while Lindum presumably was then well established. It may be added that *C.I.L.* vii. 187 records a veteran of the Legio XIV at Lindum. Since that legion left Britain only in 68, and after a short stay at Moguntiacum was permanently in distant Pannonia from about 100, it is not unreasonable to assume that the inscription is of the first century; the veteran would thus be one of the 'senes' referred to by Calgacus.

Mr. Haverfield informs me that the genuineness of the Camelon inscription (note II) is doubtful. I subjoin a more accurate text, which he has kindly sent me.

M I L I T E
S • L • P • A
D I E
V I R T
• L • M

R. KNOX M'ELDERRY.

Queen's College, Galway.

STUDIES OF LATIN WORDS IN -cinio-, -cinia-.

III.—*mantiscinatur*.

The authority for this word is *Capt.* 896, with the following context:

- nam filium
- 873 tuom modo in portu Philopolemum
uiuom, saluom et sospitem
uidi in publica celoce.
- 891 di immortales, iterum gnatus videor si
uera autumas.
: : ain tu? dubium habebis etiam, sancte
quom ego iurem tibi?
postremo, Hegio, si parua iuri iurandost
fides
uise ad portum. : : facere certumst, tu
intus cura quod opus est.
- 895 sume, posce, prome quid uis, te facio
cellarium.
: : nam hercle, nisi mantiscinatus probe
ero, fusti pectito.
: : aeternum tibi dapinabo uictum, si
uera autumas.

NO. CXLIV. VOL. XVIII.

Morris, in his note on this verse, renders *nisi mantiscinatus probe ero* by 'if I do not make good provision.' It is not clear to me whether by 'good provision' he means to give an equivocal sense to *mantiscinatus* or not. Certainly Plasberg (*Rhein. Mus.* 36, 738) suggests no equivocal sense, but derives *mantiscinatus* from *mantisa* which, after Sabbadini, he defines by 'sauce': whence *mantiscinatus* means 'sauce-maker.' As to *mantisa*, I have no opinion to advance, but Plasberg has contributed to the solution of the difficulty raised by Ussing and echoed by Schoell, relative to the interpretation of *mantiscinatus*. That it's plain and evident sense here is 'play the *μάρτυς*' seems to me clear from Hegio's *si uera autumas* in 891 and 897, but there is an equivocal sense on *μάρτυς*. The well-fed gourmet priest is still in evidence in the world; and even the frugal itinerant minister of our plain Southern

H H

life is proverbially held to be the natural enemy of the yellow-legged chicken and other delicate fowl. In Greek (and Roman) antiquity the priest (*ιερεύς*) also divined (cf. the Latin glosses *diuino* 'μαρτεύω' and *diuinus* 'μάντις') from the entrails of the victim he had slaughtered, and the sacrifice was so inevitably followed by a feast that the very act of slaughtering for a feast came to be designated by the verb *ιερεύει*: cf. *Odys.* β 56 βούς *ιερεύοντες* . . . εἰλαπινάζουσιν) (*ibid.* ω 215 δειπνον δ' αἶψα συνὼν *ιερεύσασε*).

What wonder then that Plautus, or his Greek original (Eupolis dubbed a wine-bibber *ιερεύς Διονύσου*) should have employed *μάντις*, the name of the divining priest, equivocally, 1st for the diviner, 2nd for the gourmet overlooking the preparations for the feast?

Touching the form of the compound *mantis-cinatur*, the existence of *leno-cinatur*, *latro-cinatur* may have furnished the analogy after which Plautus wrote *mantis-cinatur* rather than the normal *manti-cinatur*.¹

IV.—*Tuburcinatur* 'raptum manducat' (Nonius 179, 18).

The riddle of this word, absolutely unexplained in the books at my disposal—which include, besides the usual lexica and handbooks, complete files of the *Journals* of Kuhn, Bezzenberger and Brugmann, as well as the *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*—I cannot hope to have finally solved. But my collection of guesses may perhaps suggest to another a final solution, and to that end I communicate them.

The verb is close enough in meaning to *μάντις-cinatur* to raise the question whether it does not also correspond in formation. But the word not only wears a complicated look, its orthography is uncertain. In the Plautus occurrence (*Persa* 122) the MSS. (Palatini only, A non legente) read *turbur-cinatur*, but the editors correct in conformity with Nonius (*l.c.*). Supposing the Palatini to be right, as against the grammarian, two reasons may be advanced for the accepted orthography: (1) as Quintilian (1. 6. 42) has bracketed together the two words *tuburcinabundus* and *lurcinabundus*,—both of which he ascribes to Cato and calls

too archaic for contemporary usage,—it is a fair supposition that *tuburcinabundus* has been brought into rhyme with its synonym *lurcinabundus* 'gulosus';² (2) the gloss *gulosus* 'tabernio, popinator' suggests that *tuburcinatur* may even have been popularly connected with *taberna* 'inn' (cf. *con-tabernium*). On the other hand, if Nonius's spelling be etymologically correct, the variant *turburcinatur* may be due to a popular interpretation attested by the gloss *tuburcinatus* 'turbatus.'

There is a *tertium quid*: *turbur-* was the etymological form which, submitting to dissimilation, yielded both *tubur-* and *turbur-*.

1st. Supposing *tubur-* to be the correct form, the following explanation occurs to me, viz.: dividing *tu-burcinatur*, to explain *-burcinatur* as *farcinat* 'stuffs' in composition. This leaves *tu-* unexplained, unless we imagine it to be cognate with Skr. *taviti* 'is strong,' O. Bulg. *ty-ti* 'pinguescere,' whose base occurs with an *m*-determination, in Lat. *tu-met* 'swells' (cf. also Lat. *ob-tū-rat* 'stuffs,' *tū-mentum* 'stuffing'). This explanation yields a tautological compound *tu-burcinatur* 'he cram-stuffs himself.' To be sure *tu-* might be regarded as nominal, and the compound one by *figura etymologica*.

2nd. Supposing *turburcinatur* to be the correct spelling, and this to stand for **truburcinatur*, we might—in view of the curious nickname applied in a Greek comic fragment to a gluttonous flute-player, to wit: *λοπαδο-φλογητής* 'dish-piper'—explain from *tru-* 'ladle' (: *trua*) + *-burcinatur* 'plays the cow-horn,' from **trubūcinus* 'ladle-piper.' The suggestion may have come from the noisy sort of eater ridiculed on the Roman stage, cf. *manducus* in the lexica and in *Rudens* 535-6. Note further *catillat* 'devorat' (= 'dishes'). Should we put *-burcinatur* into relation with the gloss *buccones παράσιτοι* (cf. also *buccella* 'mouthful, morsel'), the previous explanation of *tru-* is less apt;—perhaps **tru-bucca* 'ladle-cheeked' would be the ultimate source.

3rd. Supposing **trubur-cinatur* to have been the original form of the word, we might set up a base *TRU-DHRO-* 'ladle' parallel with *trua* 'ladle,' *trūlla* (i.e. *trūla*) 'spoon,' cf. *truo* 'pelican,' a name reminding of the English 'spoon-bill.' The instrument suffix *-DHRO-* is well attested, and so is the base *TRU-*, reduced from *TERŌW-* (see Hirt,

¹ Subsequent to writing the last paragraph, I notice that Lindsay, in his note on *Capl.* 896 perhaps advances the same explanation in the following words: it (*mantis-cinatur*) is formed on the pattern of *uaticinor*, *lenocinor*, *patrocinor*, *ratiocinor*, etc., though *uaticinor*, does not, like the other examples, exhibit an ostensible nominative in composition.

² Be it remarked in passing that *lurcinabundus*: *lurco* 'glutton' may be accounted a normal formation from the stem *lurcin-* (cf. *termo*, stems *termōn/termin-* *terminus*; *homo*, stem *hōmīn-*).

Ablaut Nos. 223, 474, cf. 524) in the sense, 'to bore, pierce, etc.', cf. O. Bulg. *try-ti* 'terero' *τρί-μα* 'hole,' *τρυ-ηλῖς* 'ladle, spoon,' *τρί-παρον* 'auger,' *τρί-ει* 'rubs,' Lat. *truant* 'moventur,' and the words just mentioned. Operating with *TRUDHRO* 'ladle' the division would be **t(r)ubur-canus* 'ladle piper,' the very sense found already for the division *tur-bucinatur*.

I repeat in concluding that the guesses

submitted are not given out as solutions, but as suggestions toward a solution. Personally, I feel extreme reserve before a morphological restitution like the construct form **TRUDHRO*-, attested nowhere else save —by bare possibility—in this compound (see on the question of method my remarks in *Am. Jr. Phil.* 25, p. 177).

EDWIN W. FAY.

REVIEWS.

MURRAY'S EURIPIDES.

Euripides: Translated into English rhyming verse by GILBERT MURRAY, M.A., LL.D. With Illustrations. London: George Allen. Second Edition: 1904. Pp. lxxviii, 355. 7s. 6d. net.

THE object of this book is, to quote Prof. Murray's own words, 'to put before English readers a translation of some very beautiful poetry; and in the second place to give some description of a remarkable artist and thinker.' In pursuance of this object, Prof. Murray has chosen to translate two plays, the *Hippolytus* and the *Bacchae*, as being singularly characteristic of their author, as well as beautiful creations of art. Next, he has added a version of the *Frogs*, 'the chief ancient criticism of Euripides,—a satire, penetrating, brilliant, and, though preposterously unfair, still exceedingly helpful to any student who does not choose to put himself at its mercy.' Some notes, slight in texture but always useful, and occasionally packed with suggestive criticism, have been added; and an Introduction has been prefixed, of which it is not, perhaps, too much to say that it would be difficult to find anything at once saner, more illuminating, or more sympathetic. Indeed its value, as a piece of critical work, is in inverse ratio to its length. In an Appendix, on the Fragments of Euripides, Prof. Murray has set himself to reconstruct the main lines of some of the lost dramas, as well as to translate a few typical fragments of each.

We naturally turn to the translation, in order to understand not only what is the method proposed by the translator to himself, but also to see how far he has succeeded in exemplifying his method in actual practice.

Brilliant, indeed extraordinarily brilliant, as parts of this translation are (especially in the *Hippolytus*, a play which suits Prof. Murray exactly), it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the task of rendering the Greek adequately has been needlessly intensified by the adoption of a rimed version throughout. I am by no means sure that the rimed heroic metre is strictly justifiable on other grounds. For the choruses, a rimed version is doubtless more than justifiable; it is the nearest equivalent we have for strophic correspondence.¹ But just as the genius of the Greek tongue finds its most naturally poetic expression in the iambic trimeter, so the genius of the English language finds its expression in (what we call) blank verse. The intrusion, however, of rime seems to impart an artificiality to a translation, and retard the natural spontaneity of the verse,—noticeably so in the stichomuthic passages. At least, that is my impression.

This said, criticism pretty well ends; and a notice of this book would seem to pass, by a natural step, to a simple effort of appreciation. Prof. Murray's version is no mere versification of a Greek original, but, in some sense, a piece of English poetry. High praise, this, no doubt, but justified by the results attained in a volume that has, already, won for itself the enthusiastic regard of every lover of good literature.

The following are specimens of Prof. Murray's rendering—the first from one of the Euripidean fragments (the *Archelaüs*):—

¹ Milton thought otherwise, as his *Samson Agonistes* testifies. Yet one is tempted to think that, had Milton rimed his choruses there, the effect might have been more pleasing.

In the elm-woods and the oaken,
There where Orpheus harped of old,
And the trees awoke and knew him,
And the wild things gathered to him,
As he sang, amid the broken
Glens, his music manifold.

The second is from the *Bacchae* (vv. 1005 sqq.) :—

Knowledge, we are not foes!
I seek thee diligently;
But the world with a great wind blows,¹
Shining, and not from thee :

¹ In 1007, for ἀεὶ τῶν of P, Murray conjectures ἀέριον 'let them blow.'

Blowing to beautiful things,
On amid dark and light,
Till Life, thro' the tramellings
Of Laws that are not the Right,
Breaks, clean and pure, and sings
Glorying to God in the height !

It must be admitted that this last rendering is exceedingly free; it is, however, singularly successful in seizing and conveying the sense of a most intricate passage, in beautiful English.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Liber Primus et Somnium Scipionis. Edited with Introduction and Notes by FRANK ERNEST ROCKWOOD, Professor of Latin in Bucknell University. Ginn and Co., Boston, U.S.A., and London. 1903. Pp. vii, 109 and xiii, 22. 4s. 6d.

A satisfactory English edition of the Tusculan Disputations would be a great boon to the student, and Prof. Rockwood deserves credit for having observed the need. How far he has succeeded in supplying it may be best seen from an extract from his commentary. For this purpose I transcribe in full his notes on i. § 68.

'ut : the correlative is sic, 70. —primum : the series is continued by dein . . . tum . . . etc.—temporum, "the seasons."—maturitatem, "the ripening."—temperamentum corporum : cf. IV. 30 "corporis temperatio, cum ea congruunt inter se a quibus constamus, sanitas . . . dicitur."—quasi . . . dies : quasi modifies rotantem et significantem ; fastorum depends upon dies "the days of the calendar" : thus the moon is likened to a person who arranges the calendar.—in eodem orbe : the zodiac with the twelve constellations.—quinque stellas : see "quinque errantium," 63 n.—fixum in . . . loco : see "in medio sitam," 40 n.—duabus oris . . . cultum : cf. "habitabiles regiones," 45 n.—sub axe . . . nives : from the *Philoctetes* of Accius ; the measure is iambic trimeter.—sub axe "under the pole" ; ad "towards," "near to" ; molitur "piles up"—ἀντίποδες, "the land of the antipodes,"

The introduction is on a somewhat higher level. But if Prof. Rockwood desires the edition of some of the remaining books which he 'hopes in the future to prepare' to receive serious attention, he will revise his methods.

Compositions and Translations. By the late HENRY CHARLES FINCH MASON, sometime Scholar of Trinity College and Bible Scholar in the University of Cambridge ; Porson Prizeman and Sir William Browne's Medallist (1878) ; Assistant Master in Haileybury College, 1885–1902. With Prefatory Memoir by R. C. GILSON, Trinity College, Cambridge ; Headmaster of King Edward VI.'s School, Birmingham. Edited by H. H. WEST, formerly of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press Warehouse, 1903. Pp. xvi, 167. 3s. 6d. net.

It was with a shock that I learned from this memorial volume that one of the most gifted composers among my former pupils was no more. H. C. F. Mason stood out in a brilliant year for the ease and grace of his Greek and Latin verse : and this small and well printed volume is a worthy and fitting tribute to his memory. He had the taste and plastic touch of the born literary artist, and he served the Muse with a single devotion. It follows that this selection from his literary remains is, speaking generally, of a high order of merit and can be recommended to all (and these are happily still not so very few) who love to see Greek and Latin elegances flowing from an English pen. The variety in the passages selected shows the versatility of Mason's powers. And that with him Classical composition was not the knack which it sometimes is and much oftener is asserted to be is evident from his felicitous translations into English, few as these are.

I quote from the version of Martial viii 32 the four last lines

si meliora pia^s fas est sperare sorori
et dominum mundi flectere vota valent,
haec a Sardois tibi forsitan exulis oris
fratre reuersuro nuntia uenit auis.

If sister fond may hope once more
And prayers may bend the King of men,
It heralds from Sardinia's shore
Her exile brother home again.

Minute criticism in the present instance would not be fair either to the author who could not or to the editor who might not revise: and the occasional lapses and oversights, accentual or otherwise, will detract but little from the pleasure of the reader. But I may advert to a licence in the Greek anapaests, the too common use of a paroemiac like *τεύχε' Ἀρείων ἐπιβαστρει*, inasmuch as it points to a reading of the anapaestic measure with the ictus of the hexameter still very prevalent in schools. And I think moreover that it would have been better if the alternative renderings of single lines had been relegated to an appendix. The conscientious editor has placed them at the foot of the page; but in a matter of this kind the lesser accuracy is the greater fidelity.

J. P. P.

Introduction à l'étude comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes. Par M. A. MEILLET, directeur adjoint à l'école des Hautes-Études, professeur à l'école des Langues Orientales. Un volume in-8°, broché, 10 fr. (Hachette et C^{ie}, Paris).

'Ce livre a un objet très limité: celui d'indiquer brièvement les concordances qu'on observe entre les diverses langues indo-

européennes et les conclusions qu'on en peut tirer. Il n'est pas destiné aux personnes qui savent la grammaire comparée des langues indo-européennes; elles n'y trouveraient ni une idée nouvelle ni un fait nouveau. Il présente seulement un aperçu de la structure de l'indo-européen, telle que la grammaire comparée l'a révélée.'

The useful purpose thus modestly described by its author may be said to have been judiciously and lucidly carried out. The style is clear and the examples throughout seem excellently chosen. Prof. Meillet acknowledges warmly his debt to Brugmann, Delbrück, and others, including the veteran De Saussure, on whose teaching the book is really based. This gives a rather old-fashioned shape to the treatment of Ablaut ('Alterance des Voyelles'), a section in which there is hardly any trace of the research pursued so actively for the last twenty years, and much that in form at least is decidedly misleading. The most interesting part of the book, and the most independent, is perhaps the two concluding chapters 'The Vocabulary' and on the general features of the development and differentiation of the I.-Eur. languages. Both are eminently sane and suggestive, and show a healthy scepticism towards the Schrader-type of 'Palaeontology'; though one would have gladly seen a deeper familiarity with Kretschmer's results than is indicated by a distant though respectful reference (in the Appendix to his *Einleitung zur Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache*). The book should do much for Comparative Philology in its own country, and something, perhaps, further afield; and it is greatly to be regretted that the absence of an Index of forms makes it almost useless for reference.

R. S. CONWAY.

MANCHESTER, August, 1904.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

MISS HARRISON'S GREEK RELIGION.

Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.

By JANE E. HARRISON, Hon. D.Litt. Durham, Hon. LL.D. Aberdeen, Fellow and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. xxii + 630 pp. 15s.

MISS HARRISON has long been recognized as an authority on the archaeological side of

Greek religion; but the present volume is a much more ambitious attempt than those which she has written before. It is an attempt to penetrate below the organized pantheon of the Olympians, to the bedrock of faith. Thus it comes about, that part of the work is devoted to rank superstition, and part to the more or less exalted and ethereal doctrines which were evolved by those who were not satisfied with superstition.

It is strange, but we see it every day, that these two conceptions of religion can exist side by side, not only in different sections of one society, but in the mind of one man. The student whose idea of Greek religion is based on the tales of mythology, so beautiful in the main, and following Homer's example ignores or smiles at all that is gross in them, will have to reconsider the matter in the light of Miss Harrison's facts.

One important principle, which has been becoming more and more evident with each step of research, is well established in Miss Harrison's book: the essential difference between two types of ritual. On the one hand, there is the apotropaic ritual, due to fear of mischief, and directed towards those beings who are believed to be the sources of mischief: on the other hand, the ritual of hope and worship, directed towards the gods whose work is beneficent to mankind. The former class of beings have their abode below, in the earth, in darkness, and their ritual is of the barbarous and involves a vicarious victim; the other class dwell above in the light, and their worship involves the offering of a gift. If the gift is often an animal, it is given rather to please than to avert evil, as a means of happy social life and merriment rather than as the *corpus vile* of punishment. And as the latter class is associated chiefly with triumph and feasting, so the former is associated with mourning, and lamentation, and woe. Not that the two classes can be always kept apart. The hero's ghost may be approached to confer prosperity or fertility, and the Olympian to avert a plague; yet it does appear as if the two functions were originally not combined, or not often so. We are not yet in a position to unravel all the threads, and confidently to assign each deity to his proper place, or to tell what were the proper deities of each race or each period; but Miss Harrison's investigation takes us a step further on the road. A necessary corollary to this investigation is the question, how the lower gods are related to the higher, whether they were always distinct or whether one can grow into the other. In the case of certain deities the development is clear. Asclepius for instance grows before our eyes from a man to a hero, from a hero to a god. But the greatest of the pantheon seem to stand above this. We have here to deal with primitive conceptions of religion, and to ask whether the personifications of sky and sun

and air cannot have sprung full-grown gods from the brain of early man. This other side of the question is out of the scope of Miss Harrison's book, which she modestly calls the *Prolegomena* to Greek Religion. Her part is to insist on the lower side, which has been unduly neglected: for the other, a wide induction is necessary, and the person marked out for the task is happily amongst us. We venture to hope that Dr. Frazer may ere long be induced to pass on from his golden bough to the trunk of the great tree, and to attempt the exhaustive examination of Greek religion which the world expects from him.

Miss Harrison begins her work with an examination of chthonic ritual, taking in turn the ritual of ghosts and sprites, the agricultural festivals, and demonology in general. She is successful in showing the great importance of the cult of the dead, with its rites of purgation and imprecation, and its devoted holocaust. Perhaps she does not sufficiently remember that social feasts also formed part of this cult, as of the Olympian worship, and does not fully face the question how these two phases were related. A sort of compromise seems to be effected by the rule that victims killed for a hero-feast had often to be consumed on the spot and before a fixt limit of time. The analysis of the agricultural feasts is most ingenious in connecting them with the worship of the dead. Thus the Pithoigia is regarded not only as the opening of the wine-jar, but as the opening of the grave-jar, out of which flutter the *κῆρες* or souls of the dead. The bearing of this on the puzzling myth of Pandora is obvious, and has been well worked out. It is not likely, however, that the use of a jar in burial was suggested by its use as a dwelling place for the living. No doubt other men besides Diogenes have lived in a jar, but the invention of jars is not coeval with the human race, who must have lived somewhere; nor is the use of a jar for a house attested for any number of people at any time. This is one of several suggestions which seem more fanciful than true. The suggested connexion of Diasian and other words with Latin *dirus* is attractive, but in view of the very obscure etymology of that word (which may have suffered analogical change) remains little more than a clever guess. There is no need to derive Diasia from *Δῖος* when *δῖος* exists, and Polemon (if the text of Athenaeus 478 c is sound) uses the phrase *δῖον κοδῖον*. It

will probably be agreed, however, that Miss Harrison's account of the Anthesteria is more rational and convincing than others. It is clearly implied in the proverb *θίραζε κῆρες, οὐκέρ' Ἀνθεστήρια*, as explained by Suidas, that the ghosts went about the city during that feast (much as their descendants the Kalikázari do now before Epiphany), and that the ceremonials were avertive. The word is derived not from *ἄνθος* but from the root *θεο-* in *θέσσαντο* (and perhaps *θεός* itself). The account of the Pharmakos too is excellent. The ritual is described in full from Tzetzes, and all the details are carefully analyzed; the ceremony is interpreted quite rightly as a purification, the devotion of a scape-man to appease an offended god. The element of transferred evil must also be borne in mind; this is present in all such expulsive ceremonies, and has been well illustrated by Mr. W. W. Skeat's researches in the Malay peninsula.¹ It is surprising how many more examples of purification meet us in the analysis of other Greek festivals. Special interest and special difficulties attach to the Women's Festivals. From the Cretan discoveries it would appear that women played a very important part in the early religion of the Greek world; and as Miss Harrison is doubtless right in claiming a Pelasgic origin for the Mysteries, there may be new light thrown on these by further investigation in that direction. Unfortunately the female sex were in ancient days good at keeping secrets, and even Herodotus who knew something about the Thesmophoria, was afraid to speak, so that we must remain in doubt as to the details of the ritual.² It does not seem likely that the pigs let down into the chasms were taken up at the end of a year (p. 123). Miss Harrison regards *κάθοδος* and *ἀνοδος* as the two acts of going down into the chasms and coming up, and with Hesychius places them on the same day. I do not know whether she has seen Mr. Rogers's different account of this festival (Translation of the *Thesmophoria-zusae* p. vii ff.). He regards *ἀνοδος* as the going up to the Temple, and the *κάθοδος* as the descent of Persephone, and ingen-

iously explains *μέση* as 'not the 'middle day' of the festival, which lasted for four days, but the 'day between' the descent to Hades and the *Καλλιγένεια* or New Birth. In the discussion of the meaning of *Thesmophoria*, Miss Harrison mentions the theory that *θεσμοί* meant 'things laid down,' and that the word was applied to 'the *sacra*, including the pigs,' herself choosing to regard it as meaning 'spells.' But there is no evidence of any such meaning for *θεσμός* or its root *θεο-*, which implies prayer rather than spells. The fact that curses were uttered at this feast proves nothing as to the meaning of *θεσμός*, and the ending *-φóρια* bears strongly against the theory. The word still remains obscure. Nor is the derivation of Mystery from *μύσος* 'pollution' convincing: still less the suggestion that the odd little vessel called *κέρχνος* was explained by a scholiast as a *λίχνον*, because the former contained separate doles of various grains or products, and the latter separated the grain from the chaff. If so, he might almost as well have called it a midriff. But while it seems to me that Miss Harrison's derivations are often fanciful, and misleading, yet the general presentation of the facts of this difficult group of feasts, and particularly the summing up on pp. 161-2, is excellent. It is especially gratifying to find that she pronounces against the 'modern connotations of vicarious expiation and mystical communion' in Greek sacrifice. I believe that this is sound, and that the Greek ideas of religion were in the best period remarkably simple and sane.

The section on Keres is admirable, and a great deal of new evidence is brought together, and well illustrated from vase-paintings. These seem to be ghosts, and the sprites of disease, old age, death, and all sorts of mischief. Miss Harrison even identifies or connects them with the Gorgon, Empusa, Sphinx, Lamia, and Siren. It is part of her fancifulness to call them *bacilli*, but the identification would perhaps be taken in earnest by Sir Oliver Lodge. Erinyes and Eumenides are also brought into the same kin.

Miss Harrison next deals with the *Making of a Goddess* and the *Making of a God*. In the former section, groups of nameless female divinities, which appear in twos or threes, are seen crystallizing in form and evolving into more exalted shapes. Some acute remarks are made on general questions, such as the traces of matriarchy in the stories, the peculiar relation 'half

¹ I may add that Mr. Skeat has a remarkable account, from the lips of a Malay, of the various stages in substitution for a human victim.

² Miss Harrison's translation of the account of these, from a scholiast on Lucian (p. 122 note), appears, if correctly printed, to mistake the meaning of *ὅταν ἀποτιθῶνται τὰ πλάσματα ἐκείνα*. It runs: 'When they replace the remains by those well-known images (*ἐκείνα*).'

mother half lover" of the goddesses (such as Demeter) to the male figures which are associated with them (as Triptolemus). Some current mistakes are corrected: as the assumption that the Semnai were identical with the Eumenides. This section is not easy to follow, owing to the number of different items which are to be combined. The author sums up as follows: 'we have seen one woman-form take various shapes as Mother and Maiden; we have seen these shapes crystallize into Olympian divinities as Athene, as Aphrodite, as Hera, and as it were resume themselves again in the great monotheistic figure of Venus Genetrix.' But as she acknowledges herself, the processes are not clear: links are wanting in the chain, and the reader is left with the feeling that there is too much assumption. With the gods the case is different; for the transition from ghost to hero and thence to god is clear enough in one or two cases, and simpler than with the female divinities. I cannot but feel that Miss Harrison has here not gone deep enough. I do not think that we are at all ready to trace the history of the female divinity. Her antiquity is yearly becoming more clear; but her origin and development cannot be traced without a wide excursion into comparative religion. Moreover, the question of the origin and growth of a given figure is distinct from the process which so often meets us in Greece, where an alien deity obtrudes itself full-grown into the pantheon. These chapters thus appear rather as a collection of notes, highly interesting, but not complete enough to place the main principles beyond controversy. In one place the fancifulness which has been noted above is specially strong. In discussing a group of three female figures on an archaic stone (fig. 73), Miss Harrison says that the sculptor (Sotias, by the way, was the dedicator) 'has massed the three stately figures very closely together; he is reverently conscious that though they are three persons, yet they are but one goddess. He is half monotheist.' Yet any artist of this date, in making three figures to stand side by side, would have represented them with the same regularity; he had not skill to do otherwise. Indeed, a similar argument would deduce monohippism from almost any team of steeds painted upon an early vase.

With Dionysos Miss Harrison rises to something like enthusiasm. With practically all scholars, she agrees that he is a foreign god introduced from without, and

she makes an interesting point in connecting the Satyrs with the tribe of Satrae. There can be little doubt that both Satyrs and Centaurs were, as she holds, wild men; but she offers no explanation of the origin of the centaurs' hybrid form, other than suggesting that they were a tribe of horse-lovers. We know that the Americans thought the Spaniards and their horses to be one, a new animal, and a similar idea would be natural to a primitive tribe seeing horses for the first time. But the Greeks were too intelligent to believe that, and these hybrid forms are, I think, not found in Greek art, except where foreign influence is present: as in the men-bulls of Sicily. Was the type due to an attempt to represent a man on horseback, or was it borrowed from a foreign source? Perhaps the Cretan minotaur may yet help us to an answer. In the discussion of Maenads and Thyiads it seems to me that a good deal of trouble has been taken unnecessarily: it is not likely that any one would deny that Maenad is an adjective, or that all these terms could be used to describe human revellers. The analysis of this god is well done. His mother Semele is identified on good grounds with the earth; the word is hardly changed in Slavonic, as we see from the Russian *zemlya* (not *zembla*, as the quotation of that title on p. 405 might suggest). The god's worship was always connected with an intoxicant, as is the case with many old and modern cults (an important example is the Indian *soma*), and the god's titles suggest that the grape was superimposed on an earlier drink made from a cereal. Thus *βρόμος* may be derived, as the Emperor Julian suggested, from *βρόμος* 'oats,' Mod. Gr. *βρόμη*; the epithet *βραῖτης* found in the Delphic paean is compared with a late Latin word *braisum*, 'grain prepared for making of the beer *braisum*'; *σαβαῖος*, with *sabaia*, an Illyrian beer; and finally, *τραγῳδία* is associated with *τράγος*, a kind of spelt. If the explanations here given are correct, the spread of grape-growing caused the god's original drink to be forgotten, and the popular mind soon busied itself in finding new derivations for *βρόμος* and *τραγῳδία*. The ruder cereal-drinks are native to northern Thrace, where also is to be found that tree-worship which we meet with in Dionysos Dendrites. Not that all Dionysos can be explained on this principle: the bull at least remains, and Miss Harrison's allegorical interpretation hardly fits with the primitive view disclosed above, nor is the connexion of *διθύραμβος* with *θρίαμβος*

'*μαῖα*' and the *θρία* who are identified with bees, likely to carry conviction without further evidence.

If Dionysos has possibilities as the source of inspiration, his story is not to be compared to that of Orpheus for beauty and significance. In Orpheus there is nothing ugly; he is a being all spiritual, all purity and melody. Miss Harrison is willing to see in him a real man, 'poet, seer, musician, theologian,' who became afterwards a hero, and the inspiration of a faith which held the finest essence of religion. The rest of the volume is an examination of the Orphic mysteries and eschatology. Here, as in most human religions, human nature has combined much that is gross and ugly with the nobler ideals which came from founder. It seems reasonable to suppose that the savage element comes from ancient rites which were continued by the worshippers after the new teacher had passed away. Bull-tearing and raw food are coarse enough, but worse still the devouring of a human child, which not improbably went before (p. 489); such a practice is primitive indeed, and wholly alien to all that the stories tell of Orpheus. The practice seems to belong to Crete as well as Thrace, and we are again reminded of the Minotaur.¹ The evidence collected as to the ceremonial of initiation is full and valuable; and the author has made a most happy hit in identifying the scene of Strepsiades and Socrates in the *Clouds* as a parody of Orphic initiation. No less valuable and original is the discussion on the use and signification of the *liknon*, a subject which Miss Harrison has made specially her own: we need not enter on this topic now, since her views have already been put before the world. This *liknon*, used also as a cradle, appears in the Orphic rites and in the ritual of marriage; a symbolical marriage seems to have formed part of the ritual of Dionysos, and to have been allegorized by the Orphics. From the Orphic rites, *liknophoria* passed into the Eleusinian mysteries, where a sacred marriage and birth were represented, and these Miss Harrison believes to have been the central mystery. The Orphic tables are finally translated and analyzed, and interpretations offered of vase-paintings illustrating the rites. Here Miss Harrison comes back to her starting-point;

for she finds that 'all the canonical denizens of the underworld are hero and heroine figures of the older stratum of the population.'

I have indicated in passing the chief topics of this book, and offered a few criticisms; and now it will be well to take a brief review of the whole. Firstly it must be said that the book would greatly have gained by compression. There is a great deal of rhetoric about it, too much reiteration, questions constantly being asked as they might be asked in speaking to an audience whose wandering thoughts must continually be shepherded, too many merry jests. To take an instance almost at random, how much the statement on p. 305 would gain in force if the whole sentence 'At first sight . . . to explain the word' were omitted. These expansions do not help the careful reader: they distract him. The general diffuseness of the style is to be regretted because the facts examined are many, the details minute and difficult to remember, and sound combinations consequently hard to make. The author's judgment, again, is often led astray by a too facile fancy, which is attracted by explanations more specious than true; and this is especially dangerous in dealing with etymology.

The details are surprisingly accurate, considering their number: but some of them are wrong. We read not only of the 'King Archon' (p. 33), a title never used, but even of the 'Queen Archon' (p. 537); that old cock of Asclepios dies hard, here he is again (p. 149), although Miss Harrison should know that the cock is the poor man's offering, not peculiar to one deity; *πρόβατον* cannot mean a pig (15); *ἄρα* does not mean 'curses' (22). Some of the passages cited are translated wrongly. The rendering of *ἔχει πνοάς* (Aesch. *P.V.* 800) as 'endure their breath' is surely inadmissible without a possessive; and others have been mentioned already. The index is very poor, only six pages when it should have been sixty. But these blemishes, except the last, are small in comparison with the sterling value of the work as a whole. The importance of the 'lower religion,' if the phrase may be allowed, is for the first time brought out in something like its true force; and the truth is recognized, that we have the fusion of two distinct principles, which (I may add) were probably not sprung from the same race. Chief of all, in my opinion, is the paramount importance now seen to attach to

¹ It may be worth mentioning that the practice of cleaning *with mud*, which Miss Harrison finds unnatural (p. 493), may be seen any day in India. The people cleanse their bronze bowls in that way, and often also their feet and legs.

the relation of motherhood in Greek religion. The feminine element holds a chief place in nearly all the early cults which Miss Harrison examines, and the relations of Mother and Daughter or Mother and Son reappear again and again. It may be hoped that a careful examination of the Cretan discoveries will reinforce this view. I am especially interested to see Miss Harrison state her view that 'prehistoric Crete has yielded, I venture to think will yield, no figure of a dominant male divinity, no Zeus; so far we have only a beast-headed monster and the Mountain Mother' (p. 498). That she should have come to this conclusion with her wide knowledge of Greek myths and ritual is a striking fact, and may perhaps give pause to that large and apparently growing throng who bow the knee to the phantom God of the Double Axe. Here I am convinced that she is right; and I hope some archaeologist who is not committed to a theory will speedily take in hand the mass of material now available, and will illustrate it by an examination of the numerous facts already known touching the place of women in early Greek ritual.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

ON THE ANCIENT SCULPTURES EXHIBITED AT THE BURLINGTON FINE ARTS CLUB.

CORRECTIONS IN PROFESSOR FURTWÄNGLER'S
REPLY (*C.R.*, Nov. pp. 419 sq.).

P. 419a, par. 1. The two last sentences but one should read:

'I see the author of the *Essays on the Art of Pheidias* must have a very different conception of the style of Pheidias from what I have. I am sorry for him that he does not see the pure beauty of that head. And as to the genuineness all I can say is that my whole experience trained in long years' work as well as careful and repeated experiments make me absolutely sure that the head in question is indubitably genuine.'

P. 420a, par. 1, middle of last sentence but one. For 'is not in the least too thick' read 'correspond exactly and that the latter is not in the least too thick.'

P. 420b, last sentence after *Heraeum* read 'which appeared on June 25th in the *Berliner Philol. Wochenschrift* with two replies on Sept. 24th.'

[Owing to a misdirection the above corrections arrived too late to be made in our November issue.—Ed. *C.R.*]

PROFESSOR FURTWÄNGLER'S METHODS.

PROFESSOR FURTWÄNGLER promises that he will shortly publish the terracotta head of Zeus which I maintained was a forgery, and, if not a forgery, certainly not what he judged it to be. I await the publication with interest, if not with impatience—certainly with composure. Yet I must at once point out that there is some difference between his present statement that it is 'a fine work of magnificent Pheidian style,' and his original pronouncement in the catalogue where it was described as 'a Greek work of the great period of Pheidias,' and in contrast to all copies of works from the Pheidian period 'which appear coarse, empty and dead beside this wonderful work,' he maintained that 'he was acquainted with no second work at all in the round, that affords us even approximately so high a conception of the sublimity of the images of gods in the greatest period of Attic art, combined with such a freshness and delicacy of execution. It may be conjectured that the head belonged to the model for a large statue. It is, in any case, by the hand of one of the first masters of Greece, and a work entirely unique in character; I know nothing similar to, or comparable with, it.' I feel bound to point to this discrepancy in the tone and purport of these dogmatic statements, because I have before this experienced the effects of a proceeding it foreshadows. So, for instance, in his review of my *Argive Heraeum*, to which he refers the reader in his 'reply' and to which I replied in the *Philolog-Wochenschrift* of Sept. 24—a caricature of what a fair review ought to be—he studiously evades the most important question concerning the Argive sculptures on which we were at issue. He had previously opposed my contention that the sculptures were Polycleitan by the dogmatic assertion, that 'all (my ital.) these works had nothing whatever to do with Polycleitus and his school: they were beyond all doubt (sicher) Attic.' The greater part of an important chapter in the *Argive Heraeum* was devoted to a refutation of his statement. In his review he practically ignored the refutation, but said in a few lines: 'Two of these metope-heads have something Polycleitan.'

In this 'reply' again he is misstating my case when he says, that I base my protest against his methods upon 'two things,' namely his estimation of that one terracotta and his judgment concerning the

Leconfield head. In the short article to which his is a reply, I enumerate five instances to illustrate my point; in an article in the *Hellenic Journal*,¹ which appeared about the same time, I give further instances where I think he has been misled by his faulty method of stylistic comparison, and I there say that 'there is not a single chapter in his *Meisterwerke* in which I do not feel prepared to point to such misleading comparisons.' While in Vol. I. of my *Argive Heraeum*² I devote a chapter to the illustration of the fatal conclusions to which his habits of exposition lead him.

I desire to make it clear beyond all doubt against what I am thus protesting: I am far from not recognizing that, among the numerous works which Professor Furtwängler's industry has produced, there are some that are of great value and that have advanced archaeological science. Even when I have felt most strongly opposed to one side of his method and to some of his results I have gone out of my way to acknowledge the positive good that he has done.³ On the other hand I am sincerely convinced that if his procedure of stylistic identification is generally adopted, this department of the study of classical archaeology will justly lose its claim to trustworthiness. For in no other one of the inductive sciences, based on scientific observation and comparison, would the formation of such hasty conclusions, expressed in such dogmatic terms, be tolerated. Though hypothesis and conjecture are moving factors in scientific research, which help to break new ground, we must never in our exposition allow ourselves to be carried away into believing, and into making others believe, that the sphere of hypothesis and conjecture is that of full demonstration and certainty. Though I emphatically believe that in the study of Greek sculpture we need not confine ourselves to the well known and more or less established monuments of the best Greek periods, and must widen the circle of our enquiry by entering into the domain of later Hellenistic, Graeco-Roman, and Roman art, and the numerous copies and modifications of earlier works which they produced, it cannot advance the science as a whole, and it must demoralize the powers of observation of the learners, when late and inferior Roman works are held up as illustrations of the great Greek masters because of some correspondence in attitude

or material technique, while a vast preponderance in points of difference, if not of contrast—which act as negative instances to the generalization—is entirely ignored. Moreover, after announcing such a similarity upon which a relationship between such works is founded, a relationship barely admissible as a conjecture, Professor Furtwängler will glide into assurance as he proceeds, until he will at last refer to his first conjecture in such terms as 'as we have seen' or 'as I have shown or proved a certain statue is Myronian or Pheidias or Praxitelean,' or even, 'it is the work of Myron, Pheidias, Praxiteles, Euphranor, etc.' Now, as in all inductive sciences, so in the study of classical archaeology, the cases in which the identification of a statue, to which no descriptive inscription is appended, may be said to be established with certainty, are very few; and this paucity of demonstrably proved identification must counteract the assurance of every student of that science. There are however a few cases in which, let us say, by accident or good-fortune, the student may have complete confirmation as to the correct judgment of his 'eye.' In the work on Pheidias, concerning which Professor Furtwängler has gone out of his way twice to express his sweeping condemnation, I happen to have had the good fortune to announce that a certain head in the Louvre and a fragment of relief-work found on the Acropolis of Athens were of Pheidias style and belonged respectively to the metopes and the frieze. When casts were made of these fragments they were found to fit exactly upon the works to which, by comparison and the stylistic method, they had in their separateness been assigned. I hope that in the future this good fortune may also come to him. As yet I do not know any of his identifications which can receive an equal test of their correctness. I do not even think that this is the case with regard to his brilliant and justifiable conjecture in identifying the 'Lemnian Athene'; nor do I know what he will think, and still less what he will say, when I shall have published my own conjecture that the beautiful statue in question is more likely to illustrate the work of Alcamenes than that of Pheidias.

If I disapprove of his methods of 'stylistics' I also disapprove of his methods of carrying on a scientific controversy.⁴

¹ Vol. xxiv. pp. 129 sec.

² Pp. 164 sec.

³ E.g. note 3, *Argive Heraeum*, p. 164.

⁴ Can Professor Furtwängler justify his attempt (in the review of the *Argive Heraeum* which he recommends the reader of his 'reply' to consult) to

In his reply, limited to the discussion of the Leconfield head, he begins by saying: 'Mr. Waldstein does not deem the Leconfield head actually a forgery, but he considers it a very indifferent work, etc.' This is a misstatement which entirely misleads the reader. I began my article by saying: '*This is undoubtedly a beautiful work*; but from admitting this to stamping it as an original work by Praxiteles is a great step against which I wish to protest vigorously. We must never forget that there are no more beautiful works of ancient art extant than the Aphrodite of Melos and the Nike of Samothrace; yet we are not justified in ascribing them to any one of the great masters of ancient Greece.'

As a matter of fact it appears that I have a much higher opinion of the artistic value of that head as an original work of Greek art than Professor Furtwängler. He says of it: 'The fact that in the corners of the mouth the drill-holes are more distinctly visible than in the Hermes is due, as I have already explained (*sic*), to the Aphrodite not having come to us fresh and untouched like the Hermes, but having passed through the hands of Italian restorers and undergone a certain amount of cleaning.' I am curious to know what idea Professor Furtwängler has of the function of a restorer and cleaner of ancient statues. An antique marble in which the work of the restorer and cleaner has gone the lengths of reworking the delicate modelling of the mouth and of driving drill-holes into the corners has almost completely lost its value as an original. As a matter of fact the head in question, with the exception of the nose and the middle of the upper lip, has undergone

create a diversion from the main issue of the book, to which I referred above, by maintaining, with absolutely no foundation in fact, that I had mentioned works found by Rhangabé as having been found by us? Besides the one head found by that scholar, which I assign to him, I incur Professor Furtwängler's violent censure for assigning a large torso to him, and I devote a chapter to his excavations. But in trying to make out this case he states that a work, which I publish for the first time in the book, and concerning the finder of which I say nothing, 'was unknown to me, while every archaeologist who had ever approached the study had long been acquainted with this important work.' Does he not here try to lead every archaeologist to believe that we are dealing with a standard, well-known statue or bust? Well, the work just described is a *chip of marble containing the mouth and chin of one of the Argive heads*. Which archaeologist, I ask, was acquainted with it, before I published it because it corresponded to a far more complete fragment beside which it appears on Plate 33 containing complete heads?

no such treatment destructive of its claims to originality. It is a very fine original specimen of the period of art to which by its style it claims to belong. I wish at once to acknowledge that the reproductions of the Leconfield head given in the German edition of the *Meisterwerke* differ from the one in the English edition as stated by Professor Furtwängler and do not contain the faults to which I referred. These—and *a fortiori* Colignon's and Klein's reproduction are truer to the original. But that does not alter the fact that in the English edition, Plate 17, 'does not,' as I put it, 'convey a true impression of the work in this as well as in other respects. Whether this is due to a defective photograph or to the interference with the copper plate, I cannot decide.' *This statement of mine remains true*. If Professor Furtwängler wishes to repudiate this English edition it is his own affair. But from the Preface of that volume I was led to believe that, being later, and containing as the Preface states 45 fresh illustrations together with other improvements in the accuracy of such reproductions, the English edition was a second and revised edition of the German edition.¹ I am thus to be forgiven for not having turned to this earlier edition, especially as regards illustrations. When Professor Furtwängler writes: 'It is very characteristic of Mr. Charles Waldstein's method of work that he writes a long article upon the Leconfield head, and does not even take the trouble to look up the original publication!' he seems to put the two publications in the relation of original and copy, as used in reference to works of art. Now, I do not look upon Mrs. Strong's work in that light. To my mind it is extremely well done, and her edition is an improvement upon the earlier

¹ Cf. the English Editor's Preface: 'We are assured that, though there are some omissions with regard to Archaic art (a subject the author wished to elaborate anew) there were no material omissions. In the other chapters 'the only alterations are those that have been introduced by the author himself' (my italics). These and a number of smaller omissions and additions made by him throughout the whole book call for no special comment; they will easily be detected by the reader acquainted with the original. The majority were necessitated either by subsequent literature or by subsequent discovery.' Further: 'The number of illustrations which in the portion chosen for translation [which contains the discussion of Praxiteles and the Leconfield head] was only 162 (including plates) has been raised to 207.' And: 'The very few illustrations which in the German edition were still repeated from former publications have now been replaced from photographs.' Surely this stamps the English edition as what the Germans call a '*Zweite verbesserte Auflage*!'

German edition. I desire to state unequivocally that I *in no sense* mean to imply that she consciously attempted to vitiate the evidence by substituting the *heliogravure* of the Leconfield head in the English edition, for which Professor Furtwängler appears to lay the responsibility at her door. Still, I maintain that that plate fails to render the character of the original, especially with regard to the points in the treatment of the neck. These defects may be due to the lighting of the head when the photograph was taken, and, still more probably, to the retouching and beautifying of the copper plate in the *heliogravure*. The illustration remains useless for the purpose of accurate study of style. But it is futile to try to create a diversion from the main point of archaeological importance by discussing the relative merits of the editions or of illustrations. It is necessary to adduce them because the readers cannot see the original or the cast, and require some form of illustration to follow the discussion. I can now refer them to the German edition of the *Meisterwerke*, as well as to Collignon's and Klein's books. The real question is: Is that head by the hand of Praxiteles or not? Now, I must inform Professor Furtwängler that my comments and remarks upon this head and its style were not derived from the study of books, photographs, or even of casts, but from the notes I took when carefully examining the original itself when it was in Burlington House. He had no right whatever to make the statement, that 'I ascribe the supposed fault to the head only on the score of the reproductions!' I have just returned from a visit to Chesterfield House, where, by the kindness of Lord Leconfield, I have been able to subject the original to another careful examination. The faults in proportion in the neck ought to be manifest to any careful and unprejudiced observer. Prof. Furtwängler says he has made measurements and complains that I have not done so. His statement must be a slip of the pen. For the measurements clearly confirm my estimate of the inferior treatment of that neck and its difference from the work of Praxiteles and other artists of the fourth century B.C. Here are the accurate measurements, taken with calipers, from the original head and from casts of the others, which he refers to in his reply as proving his case.

The Leconfield Head.

Widest part of neck ...	15.3 cm.	} difference
Widest part of face		
at cheeks ...	15.6	
		} 0.3.

Cnidian Aphrodite (Munich).

Widest part of neck ...	10.3	} 1.9.
Widest part of face ...	12.2	

Cnidian Aphrodite (Vatican).

Neck ...	13.2	} 1.5.
Face ...	14.7	

Hermes of Praxiteles.

Neck ...	14.3	} 2.2.
Face ...	16.5	

Head from South Slope of Acropolis.

Neck ...	15.6	} 2.1.
Face ...	17.7	

Demeter of Cnidus.

Neck ...	13.5	} 2.0.
Face ...	15.5	

I think these measurements will speak for themselves. Those who are not specialists ought to be told that differences of even a fraction of a centimetre make the greatest difference in the proportion of the face and neck. The widest part of the face in the Leconfield head is only slightly more than one quarter of a centimetre wider than the widest part of the neck; while all the heads adduced by Professor Furtwängler himself show a difference of from one and a half to over two centimetres. In other words the difference is from 5 to 7 times as great and the neck accordingly thicker. I need say no more on this point.

But I cannot imagine how he can seriously maintain that the fatty rolls of flesh in the neck, the greatest blemish in the whole character of the Leconfield head, are paralleled by the necks of the Acropolis head or the Cnidian Aphrodite. The Acropolis head, by its attitude and general character, shows quite different conception and treatment. Yet the folds in the neck caused by the upturning of the head are far from the marked and protruding curves which we find so disturbingly in the Leconfield head.

I must beg the reader to refer to what I said about the hair and other features in my article. The composition of the hair, as well as the execution, are inferior. The *bandeau* of hair defined by the hard parallel lines running from forehead to temple and along the groove where some inserted band or wreath was fitted, is, in composition, monotonous and uninteresting, such as neither the Hermes, nor some of the later reproductions of the Cnidian Aphrodite show. The grooves between the strands of hair are flat and mechanical; while the roughness in

modelling differs materially from that in the Hermes. I can quite understand how the apparent likeness in the roughening of the surface may have seduced Professor Furtwängler into insisting upon likeness of technique with the characteristic roughness

of the hair of Hermes. Surely he does not himself believe that my views on this point, 'show,' as he says, 'with satisfactory clearness that I am not in a position to distinguish good Greek from bad Roman work.'

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Hermathena. No. 30. 1904.

A new Edition of Manilius, Book I (A. E. Housman), Robinson Ellis. *Notes on Coney's 'Irish-English Dictionary'*, T. K. Abbott. *The Origin of Pelagius*, J. B. Bury. *M. Bellanger's Orientius*, L. C. Purser. *Miscellanea* (Notes on Thucydides, Aristotle, and the Tragedians), John I. Beare. *Notes on Cicero Ad Atticum I*, J. S. Reid. *Aristotle's Doctrine of the Mean*, G. A. Exham. *The Form and Prosody of the Compounds of lacio in the Present Stem*, Charles Exon. *A Chapter on the Rhythms of Bacchylides*, F. Blass. *The Book of Enoch in the Egyptian Church*, H. J. Lawlor. *Dante's Quest of Liberty*, H. S. Verschoyle. *God and the Spirit of Man: A Transcendental Case for Theism*, Alexander R. Eagar. *Berkeley and Kant*, Reginald A. P. Rogers. *Cicero 'Ehetorica'*, W. Parker. Reviews (unsigned and mostly favourable): Nairn's *Mimes of Herodas*, Ellis' *Catulli Carmina* (Oxford text), H. C. F. Mason's *Compositions and Translations*. Notices of the following Oxford texts: Mourou and Allen's *Homeri Opera*, Marchant's *Xenophontis Opera* tom. iii, Winstedt's *Cornelius Nepos*, Burnet's *Platonis Opera* tom. iii, Owen's *Persius and Juvenal*, Cornish's *Translation of Catullus* (the reviewer objects to the expurgations), and Wickham's *Translation of Horace*. Editorial note on *Erice*, vol. i. part 1.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xxv. No. 2.

The Peripatetic Mean of Style and the Three Stylistic Characters, G. L. Hendrickson. *On the Recession of the Latin Accent in connection with Monosyllabic Words and the Traditional Word-order*, R. S. Radford. *Studies in Etymology, II*, Edwin W. Fay. *Notes on the Delian Choregia Inscriptions*, David M. Robinson. *Some References to Sea-sickness in the Greek and Latin Writers*, John C. Rolfe. Reviews, etc. Bond's *Complete Works of John Lyly* (Jas. W. Bright), Kastner's *History of French Verification* (George L. Hamilton), vom Mach's *Greek Sculpture* (Wm. N. Bates), Asser's *Life of King Alfred*, and Bradley's *The Making of English* (Jas. M. Garnett). Summaries of Periodicals. Brief Mention (observations by the Editor on Rosenberg's revision of Westermann's *De Corona*, Nairn's *Herodas*, Ouvré's *Les formes littéraires de la pensée grecque*, etc.). Recent Publications, etc.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie. 1904.

7 Sept. G. N. Hatzidakis, Γραμματικὰ Ζήτηματα (F. Solmsen). On three points in Greek grammar. H. Francotte, *L'industrie dans la Grèce ancienne* (O. Schulthess), very favourable. Horatius, *Satiren*, erk. von G. T. A. Krüger. 5. Aufl. von G. Krüger (O. Weissenfels). Chr. Muff, *Idealismus*. 3. Aufl. (G. Schneider), very favourable.

14 Sept. Euripide, *Oreste*, par H. Weil, 3. éd. (K. Busche). B. Hammer, *De re particulari usu Herodotei, Thucydidei, Xenophontei* (H. Kallenberg), very favourable. F. Bauer, *Quaestiones scenicae Plautinae* (P. Trautwein). 'An excellent dissertation.' M. Lehmerdt, *Lucretius in der Renaissance* (O. Weissenfels), favourable. L. Preud'homme, *Troisième étude sur l'histoire du texte de Suétone* (J. Tolkiehn), favourable. M. Hoogvliet, *Lingua* (J. Golling). On a universal language.

21 Sept. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part III. Ed. by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (O. Schulthess). E. Arndt, *De ridiculi doctrina rhetorica* (O. Weissenfels), favourable.

28 Sept. *Memoria Graeca Herculaneensis* prop. G. Crönert (S. Mekler). A. Rutgers van der Loeff, *De ludis Eleusiniis* (H. Stending), favourable on the whole. E. Horneffer, *Platon gegen Sokrates. Interpretationen* (H. Nohl, jun.), favourable. K. Hachtmann, *Die Verwertung der vierten Rede Ciceros gegen C. Verres (de signis) für Unterverweisungen in der antiken Kunst*. 2. Aufl. (Nohl), very favourable.

5 Oct. A. Müller, *Ästhetischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien des Sophokles* (H. G.), favourable. R. G. Kent, *A history of Thessaly from the earliest historical times to the accession of Philip V. of Macedonia* (H. Gillischewski). Contains only the fifth chapter and two appendices. Carefully done so far. G. Lazić, *De compositione secundi et tertii Ciceronis librorum de legibus* (Hoyer). Rather superficial. *The Chronicle of Morea, a history in political verse*, ed. by J. Schmitt (F. Hirsch), favourable.

12 Oct. Th. Schreiber, *Studien über das Bildnis Alexanders des Grossen* (H. von Fritze), favourable. A. Taccone, *Il trimetro giambico dei frammenti tragici, satirici e comici e dell' Alessandra di Licofrone* (H. D.). Concludes the work noticed in the No. of Aug. 17. H. Brewer, *Die Unterscheidung der Klagen nach attischem Recht und die Echtheit der Gesetze in §§ 47 und 113 der Demosthenischen Midiana* (O. Schulthess). 'A worthy contribution to the knowledge of Attic law.' *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*, ed. by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (W. Crönert).

19 Oct. Th. Sinko, *Sententiae Platonicae de philosophis regnantibus quae fuerint fata* (O. Weissenfels), favourable. J. Heumann, *De epyllio Alexandrino* (C. Fries), favourable. C. Brakman, *Bobiensia* (Th. Stangl). J. Krözel, *Quo tempore Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus habitus sit quaeritur* (E. Wolff), unfavourable on the whole. H. Stich, *Mark Aurel, Der Philosoph auf dem römischen Kaiserthron* (O. Weissenfels), favourable. G. Cevolani, *Sul periodo ipotetico latino osservazioni critiche* (J. Golling). H. C. Nutting, I. *The order of conditional thought*. II. *The modes of conditional thought* (J. Golling), unfavourable. A. I. Adamantios, *Δεσλίου τῆς Ἰστορίας*

ικῆς καὶ ἑθνολογικῆς ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος. Bd. VI. (G. Wartenberg).

28 Oct. H. Zuckenbach, *Kunst und Geschichte*. I. *Abbildungen zur Alten Geschichte*. 5. Aufl. K. Hadaczek, *Der Ohrschmuck der Griechen und Etrusker* (Th. Schreiber), favourable. F. Solmsen, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre* (Bartholomae). E. Schwartz, *Über den Tod der Söhne Zedäi* (W. Soltau). 'An excellent treatise.' A. Stein, *Die Protokolle des römischen Senates und ihre Bedeutung als Geschichtsquelle für Tacitus* (E. Wolff), very favourable. H. Omont, *Notice du ms. nouv. acq. lat. 763 de la bibliothèque nationale contenant plusieurs anciens glossaires* (W. Heraeus). K. Krumbacher, *Eine neue Handschrift der Digenis Akritas* (G. Wartenberg), favourable.

Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, etc. Vol. xiii. 9. 1904.

R. Fritzsche, *Der Anfang des Hellenentums* (from Pt. 8). The S. Achaeans, during the 3rd millennium, occupied Peloponnesus and reached Crete. The Ionians came from Thessaly to Boeotia, whilst the Minyae took over the harbours thus vacated and thence colonised W. Boeotia. These three tribes entered the sphere of the essentially oriental, pre-Hellenic Mycenaean culture: their gods had the forms not of men, but of animals and demors. But in the royal halls of the next people to immigrate, the N. (Homeric) Achaeans, the minstrels created an 'aristocratic' mythology, the foundation of Hellenism. The Hellenic culture is aesthetic, intellectual, progressive, that of the East mystic, religious, stationary. The victory of the former in Greece appears in the decline of the priestly power (due to the tendency to make the gods fairer but less sacred) and the aesthetic character of Greek science and art (rejecting in its love of beauty the aid of symbolism and sacrificing the myth to the conception of the world as a κόσμος). This culture is eminently aristocratic: Xenophanes, Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Plato all protest against it. The religious void was partly filled by borrowing Oriental doctrines, which however as un-Greek, regularly took the form of the mystery. D. Müller, *Ὀρκεῖον ἀρχαῖον*. The composer of Δ 105 sqq. utilised an old poem describing a serious wounding of Agamemnon by Pandarus (possibly but probably not, during a truce). In the existing poem we can clearly trace the difficulty he had in making the borrowed lines (esp. 140, 146 sqq., 214) tally with his account of Athene's protective measures in ll. 127-139. J. Ziehen, *Zwei neue Werke über Virgil's Aeneis*. Very appreciative reviews of Heinze's and Norden's books. 'Bring us a strikingly long way towards a complete account of V.'s life and works. Let us try to realise the author of the Bucolics and Georgics and minor poems in the same spirit and with equally well deserved success.' K. Reuschel, *Die Tannhäuser Sage*. G. Wissowa's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur röm. Religions- und Stadtgeschichte* favourably reviewed by L. Deubner, with criticisms on the view W. takes of the 'Sondergötter.'

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. 59, 4. 1904.

F. Solmsen, *Eigennamen als Zeugen der Stammesmischung in Boiotien*. Such forms as *Τελεφάνει* (normally *τελε* for *τῆλε*), *χορσῖαι* (normal *pp*), *Διδόρος* (*Διδόρ*, normal in Boeotia and Thessaly) are cited. The earlier an ex. the greater the probability of its not being a mere case of influence exercised by the rest of Greece. P.

Sonnenburg, *De Horatio et Pollione*. The first two strophes of Od. ii. 1 allude to P.'s preface which, with an account of Pharsalia (hence ll. 17-20), had been read in public. *Iam uideo* in l. 21 is Horace's forecast of the finished work. W. Schmid, *Herodes περὶ πολιτείας*. The historical knowledge and technical method make a 5th cent. author impossible. Probably H. Atticus wrote it. L. Radermacher, *Zur siebenten Satire Juvenals*. J. introduces historians because he is following an educational scheme of which we find traces in Basilus, Dionysius, Quintilian, and Dio. But as the position of historians was in no way that of the poets and rhetors, J.'s treatment of this part of the theme is brief and dull. J. H. Holwerda, *Die Tholos in Epidaurus*. An Asclepius-temple. The *σακός* is the subterranean labyrinth (home of a sacred serpent: cp. Herondas, *M.* 4. 90) and the *puteal* above, the *θυμέλα* the marble pavement of the temple itself. U. Hoefer, *Pontosevölker, Ephoros und Apollonios*. Skymnus, Mela, Nicolaus and Ap. in their account of the Mossynoeci depend mainly on Ephorus, but use Xen. as well. Anthropology confirms what they say. Diodorus did not use Xen. directly at all. Ap., in his itinerary of the Pontus-voyage, used a periegetic work, probably by Nymphodorus. P. Deiters, *Zwei Kretische Inschriften*. They refer to certain Cretans who, probably during the social war, migrated to Miletus and whose return was barred by the peace of 216 and consequent restoration to power of Gnosus and Gortyna. These cities reject the friendly intervention of Miletus on behalf of the delinquents, but are prepared to refer the matter to a Ptolemy. R. Schneider, *Die Sammlung der Fragmente des Apollonios Dyskolos*. Emendations of passages of that author and his followers. M. Manitius, *Handschriftliches zum Texte des Statius*. Two (mainly) 13th cent. MSS, the original of which belonged to the MGBS type but contained fine corrections from P or a descendant of P's. *Dresdener Scholien zu Statius Achilleis*. Th. Litt., *Ueber eine Quelle von Plutarchs Actia Romana*. Verrius' Fasti, through medium of Juba of Mauretania. A. Körte, *Zu den Bleitafeln von Styra*. *Miscellen*.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. 28, No. 1.

The recruiting of the Roman army in Egypt in the first and second centuries, Jean Lesquier. *On a MS of Cicero de inventione*, Jules Lebreton. 'The MS, which is at Trinity College, Dublin, D. 3. 36, is XI-XII century, and nearer to the family 8c than to the family PHV.' A full collation is given. *On a verse of the Sibylline oracles*, (quoted by Lactantius *Inst.* iv. 17. 4), René Pichon. *Notes on Plautus Trin.* 331-332, L. Havet. And by the same *On Phaedrus*, i. 2. 22 (*rogantes*, read *-is*, is an acc.), ii. 5. 19-20 (read 'Caesar citoque intellegit | a se ut putarit'), ii. 8. 4 (best read 'et opportuno se ibi buuili c. ndidit'), iii. 7. 3 (read 'salutati' with Perotti), iii. 11. 5 (the equivalent of a line has been lost between 'integritati(s)' and 'testis'), iv. 19. 17 (for 'legatos' read 'laxatos'). And by the same on Ovid *Met.* 8. 150 (read 'spuma ruit plumis'). *Latin Studies*, IV, *Some cases of Indirect Question* (Plautus, Terence, Horace), F. Gaffiot. *The Prose of Pomponius Mela*. 'Le traité géographique de Pomponius Mela de Chorographia est rédigé en prose métrique à la Cicéron.' L. Havet. *On de Mortibus persecutorum*, xiv. 4-5 (for 'torquebantur. erant certantes' read 'torquebant, urebant certantes'), René Pichon. *On Schol. Ar. Nub.* 153 (for *σφάττας* read *σφίγτας*), *Ar. Eg.* 1179 (*γαστρός τόμον*, read *γόμεον*), and *On a lacuna in the third Aeneid* (apropos of iii. 669 vs.),

Jules Nicole. *On a fragment of Genesis in Greek* by the same. *The halves of M* (a considered as half of *m*, a palaeographical note), L. Havet. *Inscriptions from Clazomenae*, Victor Chapot. *Bulletin bibliographique*.

No. 2.

The loan contracts of Amorgos, historical and critical notes, J. Delamarre. *Ovid's* (lost) *Gigantomachia*, *Am.* ii. 1. 11-17. H. de la Ville de Mirmont. Of this lost epic there is probably a summary in the song of the Muses in *Met.* v. 320 sqq. *On Sophocles Ant.* 45-6 and *Cic. Cato Minor* 2. 6, 3. 8, 5. 14, 8. 26, 11. 38, 23. 84. Mortimer Lamson Earle. Critical notes. *On Ausonius Technopaegnia* 12. 25, L. Havet. Read 'haec crucis effigies Palamedica porrigitur F' (F, with Weil). *Latin Studies V.* The conjunction *ut* in *Ter. Hec.* 378 and *Hor. S.* i. 4. 13. VI. The prologue of the *Heautontimorumenos* and the question of 'contamination.' F. Gaffiot. The omission of *elvai* with *ἔρωπος*, E. Harry. *Plantus.* Critical notes on *As.* 100, *Bacch.* 487, 492, 495-9, 518, 519a-519c, 530, 535-6, 558, 932, *Cas.* 47-50, 58, 126-9, 572, 617, 781-2, 786, 963, 1004, *Cist.* 508. L. Havet. *Bulletin bibliographique*.

No. 3.

On Plautus Epidicus 153-4 and 299, 243, 251, 293-5, 399, 632-3, 640, L. Havet. *Critical notes on the Metrica of Hieron*, P. Tannery. *The Greek MS 2832 in the Bibliothèque Nationale*, H. Omont. 'The MS consists of six different MSS belonging to the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. I. 1. Theocritus. 2. A collection of letters, all except the last included in Hercher's *Epistolographi Graeci*. 3. Julian's 'Caesars' and third panegyric in honour of the Emperor Constantius. 4. Xenophon's treatise on Hunting. 5. Two short treatises by Psellus on the oracles of the Chaldaeans and Sappho's hymn to Aphrodite. 6. The two books of the *Hieroglyphica* of Horapollon. The Magic Oracles of Zoroaster with Plethon's commentary and Psellus' commentary on the same.' *On Phaedrus* iv. 19. 15, 16 and 26. 23 (emendations), A. Grenier. *On the torch race at Didymi*, B. Haussoullier. *On Plautus Amph.* 232, 1063, *As.* 556, *Aul.* 65, 155-157, 257, 703, *Bacch.* 808-9, *Capit.* 398, *Men.* 597, G. Ramain. Horace's '*molle atque facetum*' as applied to Virgil, 'In *Hor. S.* i. 10. 45 *epos* should be understood with *molle atque facetum* from the preceding line,' L. Bayard. *On Ter. Phorm.* 78 and *Cicero Or.* 153 and *Ennius*, L. Havet. *Bulletin bibliographique*.

INDEX.

Note.—In the General Index names of actual contributors are printed in heavy type.

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- A.**
 Abbott's *From Letter to Spirit*, noticed, 357 ff.
Abriss der Griechischen Lautlehre, Gercke's, noticed, 63*b*, 64*a*.
 Ad Apuleium, 442 ff.
 Adam-Klissi, discoveries in, 425*b*.
 Adversaria upon the Fragments of Euripides, 194 ff.
 Adversaria upon the Fragments of Sophocles, 245 f.
 Aecae, Apulia, discoveries in, 237.
 Aegeria (Egeria), derivation of, 365*a*, note.
Aeneid vi, Norden's ed. of, noticed, 403 ff.
 Aeschylus, notes on, 241 ff.
 Zeus in, moral development of, 99*a*, f.
 Aetolia, discoveries in, 236*a*.
 Africanus Julius, *κατολ*, fragment of, 147*b*.
Agamemnon, Verrall's ed. of, noticed, 212 ff.
Alcestis 96–98, 386*a*, *b*.
 Alcestis's *ἐπισκεψαί*, Eur. *Alc.* 280–325, 336*a*, *b*.
 Albutt (T. Clifford), notice of Gabler's *Galen's de Captionibus*, 50 f.
Alexander the Great, Schreiber's *Portraits of*, noticed, 231 f.
 (Ujfalvy's), *Portraits of*, noticed, 94 f.
 Algiers, discoveries in, 378*b*.
Allen (James Turney), on Secrecy in Voting in the Athenian Law Courts in the Fifth Century B.C., 456 ff.
Allen (T. W.), Corrections. *New Homeric Papyri*, 307*a*, *b*.
 New Homeric Papyri, 147 ff.
 notice of Gardthausen's *Greek Manuscripts*, 177 f.
 Anaxagoras, *δωσιουέσια*, 217 ff.
Ancient Athens, Gardner's, noticed, 89 ff.
Ancient Battle-grounds, Kromayer's, noticed, 176 f.
 Ancient Sculptures Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club.—A Reply, 419 f.
 Anderson's *Asia Minor*, noticed, 122 ff.
 Anglicanus Heinsii of Statius' *Thebaid*, 40*b*, f.
 Antinum (Marsorum), discoveries in, 236 f.
 Antoine on Modal Attraction, noticed, 411 f.
 Aorist participle in frequentative sense, 9*a*.
 Aorist, second Greek, with first aorist forms, 110*a*, *b*.
 NO. CLXIV. VOL. XVIII.
- Aphrodite, head of, Leconfield, 134*b*, f., 419*a*, f., 472*a*, f.
 Apollo, bronze head of, at Chatsworth, 136*b*.
 Arcadia, discoveries in, 236*a*.
 ARCHAEOLOGY, 70 ff., 133 ff., 181 ff., 229 ff., 282 ff., 325 ff., 360 ff., 416 ff.
Archaic Poros-Architecture of the Acropolis, Wiegand's, noticed, 232 f.
 Argeadae, 83*a*, f.
 Argo, the, 82*b*.
 Argos, triple Zeus of, 76*a*.
 Aristarchus, notes on Herodotus, 276*a*.
 πρὸς Φιλῆταν, 275*b*.
 Aristophanes *Birds*, two notes on, 100 f.
 Thesmophoriazusae, date of, 164*b*.
 Wasps 565, note on, 49*a*.
 some recent editions of plays of, noticed, 164 f.
 Aristotle *Ethics* I. 6, 17*a*, *b*.
 his notion of τὸ διαφανές 131*a*, f.
 Article as relative, on late papyri, 155.
Art in Antiquity, Perrot's, noticed, 92 ff.
 Arusianus Messius, Citations, in from Sallust's *Histories*, 155 f.
 Ascanius and Iulus, as oak-kings, 363 f.
Ashby (Thomas, jun.), some Account of a Volume of Epigraphic Drawings now preserved in the British Museum, 70 ff.
 notice of Besnier's *Île Tibérine and De Regione Paclignorum*, 185 ff.
 recent excavations in Rome, 135 ff., 328 f.
Asia Minor, Anderson's map of, noticed, 122 ff.
 Aspiration in the *Κωή*, 107*a*.
 Assmann's *Das Flosse der Odyssee*, noticed, 331*a*.
 Athena, Lansdowne relief of, 137*a*.
 Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία and the *ἡμέρα διαμετρημένη*, 337 ff.
 Athenian tribes, four ancient, their relation to Zeus, 86*a*.
 Athens, ancient, building materials used in, 90*b*.
 discoveries in, 424 f.
Attis, Hepding's, noticed, 234 f.
 Augment and reduplication of verbs in Greek papyri, 109*b*, f.

Augment in nouns, 110a
 Ausfeld's *Prayers of the Greeks*, noticed, 423 f.
Aves, Notes on the Scholia to, 436 ff.
 American Journal of Philology, fire causes late appearance of, 193b
 Amphictyonic meetings (of 340 and 339 B.C.), dates of, 177a, b

B.

Bailey (C.), notice of Vahlen's *Ennius*, 169 ff.
Baker-Penoyre (John ff.), notice of Svonoros's *National Museum of Athens*, 233 f.
 notice of von Mach's *Greek Sculpture*, 375 f.
 Basilica of Constantine, 139a
Baur (Paul), notice of Gardner's *Ancient Athens*, 89 ff.
Bayfield, (M. A.), notice of Sidgwick's *Septem c. Thebas*, and *Persae of Aeschylus*, 159 ff.
Beare (John I.), on Herondas vii., 96, 287 f.
 Bérard's *Les Phéaciens et l'Odyssée*, noticed, 165 ff.
 Beresanj (anc. *Boporis*), discoveries in, 378a
 Besnier's *Île Tibérine* and *De Regione Paclignorum*, noticed, 185 ff.
 Beth'e's *Die Troianischen Ausgrabungen und die Homerkritik*, noticed, 331b.
 Bickel's *Stobaei excerpta Platonica de Phaedone*, noticed, 178b f.
 Blake, Greek version of, 69a, b
Blakeney (E. H.), notice of Murray's *Euripides*, 463 f.
 Bodleian manuscript's addition to Juvenal's Sixth Satire, source of, 130a, f.
 Boenig's *Minucii Octavius*, noticed, 51 ff.
 Boissier's *Tacite*, noticed, 223 f.
 Bolsena, discoveries in, 284b, 377b.
 Borneque's *Seneca Rhetor*, noticed, 221 f.
 BUEFFER NOTICES, 63 f., 178 ff., 228 f., 276 f., 464 f.
 Britain, notes upon Roman, 398 f.
 Brodribb's Translation of Minucius' *Octavius*, noticed, 54 ff.
 Brugmann's *Short Comparative Grammar*, noticed, 412 ff.
Buck (Carl Darling), 'Indo-European' or 'Indo-Germanic' (Indogermanisch) ? 399 ff.
 Building materials used in ancient Athens, 90b.
 Bulla, as solar symbol, 362a (note)
 Burlington Fine Arts Club, notes on sculpture exhibited at, 133 ff.
Burnet (John), *Platonica I.*, 199 ff.
Burrows (R. M.), notice of Anderson's *Asia Minor*, 122 ff.
 notice of Kromayer's *Ancient Battle-grounds*, 176 f.
Bury (R. G.), on Aristotle *Ethics I.* 6, 17a, b.
 on the Fragments of Euripides, 246 f.
 notice of Bickel's *Stobaei excerpta Platonica de Phaedone*, 178 f.
 notice of Shorey's *Unity of Plato's Thought*, 120 ff.
Bussell (W. F.), on the ambiguity in the use of *φύσις* in later Greek philosophy, 132b
 Butes, 84b f.

C.

Caeneus, 82b
 Caerwent (Venta Silurum), discoveries in, 379a
 Caesar's Movements, Jan. 21 to Feb. 14, 49 B.C., 346 ff.
 Callimachus, librarianship of, 275a
 Calypso, island of, identified with Perejil, 167a
 Camarina, discoveries in, 284 f.
Campbell (L.), Development of Zeus 181a, b

Cantica and *Cantor* in Roman comedy, 351a
 Capps's *Introduction of Comedy into the City Dionysia*, noticed, 180a
Case (J. E.), on *Prometheus Desmotes*, Lines 980-1, 99 f.
 notice of Sophocles' *Antigone* at the Leland Stanford Junior University, 178a
Catalogue of Painted Vases at Athens, Collignon's and Couve's noticed, 376a, b
Catalogue of School Programs, Klusmann's, noticed, 64b
 Catullus, Cornish's Translation of, noticed, 352 f.
 Celeus, 84a
 Chatsworth bronze head of Apollo, 136b
 Chronology of Caesar's movements, Jan. 21 to Feb. 14, 49 B.C., 346 ff.
 Chroust's *Monumenta Palaeographica*, noticed, 225 f.
 Cicero and Tullius regarded as two separate persons, 318b
 Cicero, *Ferriaces*, emendations of, 23 ff., 208 ff.
 -cinium, 'calling,' 349 ff.
 Citations from Sallust's *Histories* in Arusianus Messius, 155 f.
Clapp (Edward Bull), a Quantitative Difficulty in the New Metric, 339 f.
 Classical Association of England and Wales, 193a, 429a

Inaugural Meeting of:

Collins (Sir R. H.), Master of the Rolls, 64 f.
Chase (F. H.), 66b
Postgate (J. P.), 65 f.
Penrose (Miss E.), 66a, b
Butcher (S. H.), 66 f.
Gow (J.), 67a, b
Elliott (R. T. E.), 67b
Strong (Mrs.), 67 f.
Monro (D. B.), 65a, b
Horton-Smith (L.), 68a
Bell (E.), 68a
Pollock (Sir F.), 68a
Sandys (J. E.), 68a
Sonnenschein (E. A.), 68b
Conway (R. S.), 68 f.
 at Oxford, 239a, b
 Classical Association of Scotland, 1, 429a
Classical Scholarship, History of, Sandys', noticed, 271 ff., 316 ff.
 Cluni Codex of Cicero, 23a, b
 Collignon's and Couve's *Catalogue of Painted Vases at Athens*, noticed, 376a, b
 'Come, landlord, fill the flowing bowl!' Greek version of, 70a, b
Comedy, Introduction of into the City Dionysia, Capps's, noticed, 180a
 Comments and Communiqués, 1a, b, 193a, b, 335a, b, 429a, b
 Commodus, taxes of, 44b
 Comparative and superlative, confusion of, 343a
Compositions and Translations, Mason's, noticed, 464 f.
 Consideration of consequences as a test of hypotheses in Plato, 9b, ff.
 Constantine, basilica of, 139a
 Contract verbs in Greek papyri, 110b, f.
 Contracted forms of the perfect in Livy, 27 ff.
Conway (R. S.), note on W. C. F. Walters' note on an unregarded MS. of Livy, 394b
 notice of Brugmann's *Short Comparative Grammar*, 412 ff.
 notice of Meillet's *Introduction à l'étude comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes*, 465a, b

Cook (Arthur Bernard), Zeus, Jupiter, and the Oak, 75 ff., 325 ff., 360 ff.
Corax, 18 f.

Cornford (F. M.), notice of Hardie's *Lectures on Classical Subjects*, 277b

Cornish's Translation of Catullus, noticed, 352 f.

Corona civica, of oak-leaves, meaning of, 372a

Corrections, *New Homeric Papyri*, 307a, b

CORRESPONDENCE, 181a, b, 277 f.

Corruptions in Greek MSS. 341 ff.

miscellaneous, 345 f.

of comparative and superlative in Greek, 343a

of order of words (Greek), 344b, f.

of preceding syllable or sound by following in MSS. 443b (note)

of prepositions, particles, etc., 344a, b

of *set* in Latin MSS. 302a, b

Cos, discoveries in, 189 f.

Couve's, Collignon's and, *Catalogue of Painted Vases at Athens*, noticed, 376a, b

Cradle Song from Tennyson, Greek version of, 416a, b

Crete, discoveries in, 143a, 284a, 425a

Crippelianus Codex of Isaeus, corrections in, 116a, b, 119a, b, f.

Cronert's *Memoria Gracca Herculaneensis*, noticed, 402 f.

Curtius Lacus, site of, 329b, f.

Cyclops, a triple Zeus, 325 f.

gold-guarding, 327b

three types of, 326a

D.

Date of Seilanian, 229 ff.

Dionysalexander, 440 a, b

De Infinitivi apud Plinium Minorem usu, Menna's, noticed, 180a, b

De Mortuorum Iudicio, Ruhl's, noticed, 235b

Declension Greek, first and second, on papyri, 108a

third, on papyri, 109b

mixed, on papyri, 109b

Delos, discoveries in, 143a, b, 425a

Development of Zeus, 181a, b

Diana and the oak, 370

triform, 367b, ff.

Diasia, the, 85b, 466b

Diels' *Pre-Socratics*, noticed, 217 ff.

Diomedes, mist over eyes of, 240 f.

Dionysalexander, date of, 440a, b

Dionysius Halicarnassensis, notes on the text of, 260 ff.

Dithyrambic and tragic competitions, 117b

Domitian, base of equestrian statue of, 139b, f.

Donatus, Wessner's ed. of, noticed, 224a, b

Dörpfeld's *Troy*, noticed, 181 ff.

Downes (W. E. D.), The offensive weapon in the Pyrrhic, 101 ff.

Dramatic quotations, three undetected, 36b, 37a, b

Dryas, 80b, ff.

Dunn (G.), version of Shirley's 'No Armour against Fate,' 181a, b

E.

Earle (Mortimer Lamson), notes on Horace, 391 f.

on Alcestis's *ἐπισκεψίς*, Eur. *Alc.* 280-325, 336a, b

EDITORIAL AND GENERAL, 1a, b, 193a, b, 239a, b,

335a, b, 429a, b

Egeria (Aegeria), derivation of, 365a

Elliot (R. T. E.), on the pronunciation of ζ and other consonants in classical Attic, 132 a

Ellis (Robinson), notice of Cornish's Translation of Catullus, 352 f.

notice of Walzing's *Minucius Felix*, 269 ff.

Ely, Talfourd, notice of his *Roman Hayling*, 283 f.

Emendations in Statius' *Thebaid*, 300 f.

of Cicero's *Verrines*, 23 ff., 208 ff.

Julian's *Misopogon*, 21 f.

Soph. fr. 367, 245 b

Emperors, Roman, represented as Jupiter, 371a, f. as Mars, 373b

Ennius' *Hectoris Lytra*, 171a

Saturae, 171a, f.

Vahlen's ed. of, noticed, 169 ff.

Ephesus, discoveries in, 332a, b

Epistolary tenses in Greek, 296a, b, 402a, b

Epitome of Livy discovered at Oxyrhynchus, on the fragments of, 290 ff.

Erechtheus, 85

Erulus, King of the Praenestines, triple life of, 362b

esse, non-insertion of, in future infinitive, 452a

with future participle, 451b

Etruria, Zeus in, 260 f.

Euripides, *Alcestis* 96-98, 386a, b

Archelaus, English version of a fragment of, 464a

Bacchae vv. 1005 sqq., English version of, 464a, b

fragments, *Adversaria* upon, 194 ff.

on fragments of, 246 f.

Murray's Translation of, noticed, 463 f.

Eusebius, Gifford's ed. of, noticed 323 ff.

Excavations in Rome, recent, 135 ff., 323 ff.

F.

Farnell's Reports of the Proceedings of the Oxford Philological Society, 131 ff.

Fay (E. W.), Some Greek Cognates of the Sanskrit Root *triv-*, 207 f.

studies of Latin words in *-cinio-*, *-cinia-*, 303 ff., 349 ff., 461 ff.

Feminine adjectives in *-itis*, corrupted to *-itris* *-ήτρίς*, 313b

Flickinger's *Meaning of ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς* in writers of the fourth century, noticed, 179b

Folklore Classical Studies, 94a, b

Fordongianus (Forum Traiani), discoveries in, 284b

Fowler (W. Warde), note on Tacitus *Agricola*, 33.2, 43 f.

the Locust-Plague in Africa of 125 B.C.: A Modern Parallel, 394 f.

Fragments of the Minor Tragedians, *Adversaria* upon, 383 ff.

Fragmenta Tragicorum Adespota, *Adversaria* upon, 431 f.

Frank (Tenney), notice of Antoine on Modal Attraction, 411 f.

From Letter to Spirit, Abbott's, noticed, 357 ff.

Furtwängler (Adolf), on the Ancient Sculptures Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club.—A Reply, 419 f.

Future and aorist infinitive confused in papyri, 111a

Future infinitive, Latin, declinable, 451a, ff. indeclinable, 453 ff.

participle, Latin, origin of, 455b, f.

tenses, corruption of to present, 343a

G.

Gabler's *Galen's de Captionibus*, noticed, 50 f.

Gardner (E. A.), notice of Dörpfeld's *Troy*, 181 ff.

- Gardner (P.)**, notice of Sauer's *Labordic Head and Parthenon Pediments*, 282a, b
notice of Schreiber's *Portraits of Alexander the Great*, 231 f.
- Gardner's *Ancient Athens*, noticed, 89 ff.
- Gardthausen's *Greek Manuscripts*, noticed, 177 f.
- Garrod (H. W.)**, Some Emendations in Statius' *Thebaid*, 300 f.
the St. John's College (Cambridge) MS. of Statius' *Thebaid*, 38 ff.
- Gela, discoveries in, 285a
- Geographical study of Homer, 165 ff.
- Gercke's *Abriss der Griechischen Lautlehre*, noticed, 63b, 64a
- German gerundive, origin of, in infinitive, 454b, 455b, f.
- Gifford's *Eusebius*, noticed, 323 ff.
- Glover (T. R.)**, notice of Boissier's *Tacite*, 223 f.
notice of Thomas' *Pétrone: l'envers de la Société Romaine*, 229b
- GV in Latin, pronunciation of, 402b
- Goodrich (W. J.)**, on *Phaedo*, 96 A-102 A, and on the *δωτερος πλοος* 99 D (continued), 5 ff.
- Gow (J.)**, review of John Gower's *Latin Poems*, 62a, b
- Gradenwitz's *Latereuli Vocum Latinarum*, noticed, 403b
- Grammatical notes, 206 f.
from the Papyri, 106 ff., 151 ff.
- Grammichele, discoveries in, 285a
- Granger (Frank)**, Folklore and Classical Studies, 94a, b
- Greek and Eastern Parallels to Herodotus iii. 119, 386 f.
- Greek Art*, Walters', noticed, 282 f.
- Greek Cognates of the Sanskrit root *twiṣ-*, 207 f.
- Greek Grammar: Accidence*, Simonson's, noticed, 276 f.
- Greek Manuscripts*, Gardthausen's, noticed, 177 f.
- Greek, optional, rejected at Oxford, 429b.
- ostraka in the British Museum (including a Ptolemaic Fragment of the *Phoenissae*), 2 ff.
- papyri, declension of nouns in, 108 f.
- adjectives in, 109b
- numerals in, 109b.
- pronouns in, 109b
- verbs in, 109b f.
- verbs in *μ-* in, 111b f.
- syntax of, 151 ff.
- Greek Religion*, Harrison's, noticed, 465 ff.
- Greek Sculpture*, Von Mach's, noticed, 375 f.
- Greene (Herbert W.)**, note on *βουλευτής*, 49a
note on *πολυετής*, 49b
verbals in *-τος*, 23 a, b
- Greene (John)**, Notes on the emphatic neuter, 448 ff.
- Grenfell (B. W.)**, on recent literary discoveries at Oxyrhynchus, 131a
- Greenidge (A. H. J.)**, on some recent views on the authenticity of the Twelve Tables, 133a, b
Proceedings of the Oxford Philological Society, 278 ff., 415a, b
- Gudeman (A.), appointed on staff of Latin *Thesaurus*, 193b
- Gudeman (A.)**, notice of Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship*, 271 ff., 316 ff.
- H.
- Hall (H. R.)**, Greek ostraka in the British Museum (including a Ptolemaic Fragment of the *Phoenissae*), 2 ff.
- Hardie (W. R.)**, notes on the *Silvae* of Statius, 156 ff.
Hardie's Lectures on Classical Subjects, noticed, 277 b
- Harrison's *Greek Religion*, noticed, 465 ff.
- Harrison (E.)**, notice of Ramsay's *Tacitus*, 407 ff.
- Harrison (Jane E.)**, on the Mysteries in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, 418b
notice of Hepding's *Attis*, 234 ff.
notice of Ruhl's *De Mortuorum Iudicio*, 235 b
- Hayling, Roman*, Talfourd Ely's, noticed, 283 f.
- Hayman (Henry)**, reply to a critique on a recent Greek and Latin verse translation, 226 f.
- Head of Aphrodite, Leconfield, 134 b, f., 419a, f., 472a, f.
of Apollo, Chatsworth bronze, 136 b
of Zeus, No. 46 in Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition, 133 b, f., 419a
- Headlam (W.)**, *Addendum* to p. 241, 286
Greek version of 'Come, landlord, fill the flowing bowl!', 70a, b
Greek version of lines from William Blake, 69a, b
notes on Aeschylus, 241 ff.
on some tragic fragments, 430 f.
notice of Nairn's *Herodas*, 263 ff., 308 ff.
- Hellenic Society, Jubilee of, 335a
- Henderson's *Nero*, noticed, 57 ff.
- Henry (R. M.)**, on *Iliad* E 127 sqq., 240 f.
- Hepding's *Attis*, noticed, 234 f.
- Herakles, Warren Statuette of, 137a
- Herodas*, Nairn's ed. of, noticed, 263 ff., 308 ff.
- Herodotus iii. 119, Greek and Eastern parallels to, 386 f.
- Hexameter, 3rd foot of, divided either by a caesura or a thesis, 288 ff.
- Hill (G. F.)**, notice of Wiegand's *Archaic Poros-Architecture of the Acropolis*, 232 f.
notice of Wissowa's *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 228 f.
- History of Classical Scholarship*, Sandys', noticed, 271 ff., 316 ff.
- Hogarth (D. G.)**, notice of Ujfalvy's *Portraits of Alexander*, 94 f.
- Homer, psychological knowledge of, 146 b
Venetus A of, character of, 149a
- Homeric forms of subjunctive in Herodas, 268 b, f.
notes, 145 ff.
Papyri, new, 147 ff.
'homoigraphon', 37 b
- Hoogveen's *Dictionary Analogicum*, 403 b
- Horace, *Ars Poetica*, vv. 125 foll., 441 f.
notes on, 391 f.
- Housman (A. E.)**, Owen's *Persius and Juvenal*.
A Caveat, 227 f.
tunica retiarii, 395 ff.
- Housman's *Manilius* I., notice of, 63a
- Hutton (C. A.)**, notice of Walters' *Greek Art*, 282 f.
- I. J.
- Jackson (Henry)**, on a Passage in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, 260a, b
prohibitions in Greek, 262 f.
- Janus triform, 367 b, f.
- Île Tibérine* and *De Regione Paclignorum*, Besnier's, noticed, 185 ff.
- Iliad* E 127 sqq., 240 f.
- Impersonal verbs, some, 36a, b
- 'Indo-European' (Indo-europäisch) or 'Indo-Germanic' (Indo-germanisch)? 399 ff.

Inscriptiones Graecae ad illustrandas Dialectos selectae, Solmsen's, noticed, 179*a*, *b*
 Inscriptions, Greek, 142 *b*, 188 *b*, 189*a*, *b*, 332 *b*, 377*a*
 Inscriptions, Latin, 142*a*, *b*, 236 *b*, 237*a*, *b*, 398*a*, 399*a*, 461 *b*
Introduction à l'étude comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes, Meillet's, noticed, 465*a*, *b*
 John Gower's *Latin Poems*, noticed 62*a*, *b*
Johnson (Hugo H.), version of cradle song from Tennyson, 416*a*, *b*
Joseph (H. W. B.), on Aristotle's notion of τὸ διαφανές, 131 *a*, *f*.
 Isaacs, Crippsianus Codex of, corrections in, 116*a*, *b*, 119*a*, *b*, *f*.
 Thalheim's ed. of, noticed, 115 ff.
 Ithaka, discoveries in, 425*a*
 Iulus and Ascanius, as oak-kings, 363 *f*.
 Julius Africanus' *Κεφάλ.*, fragment of, 147 *b*
 Jupiter Elicius, 365 *b*
 Ilicius, 365 *b*
 Lapis, 365*a*
 Latiaris, 363 *f*.
 ousts Janus in Roman worship, 371*a*
 Juturna, 366*a*, *f*.

K.

Kenyon (F. G.), The Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία and the ἡμέρα διαμετρημένη, 337 ff.
 notice of Chroust's *Monumenta Palaeographica*, 225 *f*.
 notice of Papyrological Literature, 402 *f*.
 Kiev, discoveries in, 377 *f*.
 Klusmann's *Catalogue of School Programs*, noticed, 64*b*
 Kromayer's *Ancient Battle-grounds*, noticed, 176 *f*.
Kronenberg (A. J.), Ad Apuleium, 442 ff.
 notice of Boenig's *Minucii Octavius*, 51 ff.
 Krumbiegel's *Index to Varro's Res Rusticae*, noticed, 63*b*

L.

Laborde Head and Parthenon Pediments, Sauer's, noticed, 282*a*, *b*
 Lacus Curtius, prehistoric pottery in site of, 329*b*, *f*.
 site of, 329*b*, *f*.
 Laertiana, 340 ff.
Laird (A. G.), Herodotus viii. 2. 1, 97 ff.
 Lausdowne Relief of Athena, 137*a*
 Latin future infinitive, 450 ff.
 origin of ditto, 453*a*, *f*.
 inscriptions, unpublished, 72 ff.
 spelling, *ae*, *e*, and *oe*, 46*a*, *b*
 c and *i*, 46*b*
 i, *u*, and *y*, 46*b*
 o and *u*, 47*a*
 c and *t*, 47*a*
 d and *t*, 47*a*
 f and *ph*, 47*a*
 h omitted and added, 47*a*
 assimilation of consonants, 45 *f*.
 double consonants, 47*b*
 s(*s*) from *rs*, 159*a*, *b*
 words in -*cinio*-, *cinia*-, I. *Luscinia*, 303 ff.
 words in -*cinio*-, *cinia*-, II. -*cinium*-, 'calling,' a partially developed Latin suffix, 349 ff.
Latin Grammar, West's, noticed, 355 ff.
Latin Hexameter Verse, Winbolt's, noticed, 180*b*
 Latium Vetus, 362 ff.
Lease (Emory B.), contracted forms of the perfect in Livy, 27 ff.

Leconfield head of Aphrodite, 134*b*, *f*, 419*a*, *f*, 472*a*, *f*.
Lectures on Classical Subjects, Hardie's, noticed, 277*b*
 Lucumons, Etruscan, as representatives of Jupiter, 361*b*, *f*.
 Etruscan, as oak-kings, 362*a*
Lindsay (W. M.), the pronunciation of *GN* in Latin, 402*b*
 Lindsay's *Nonius Marcellus*, noticed, 353 ff.
 Livy, Harleianus 2493 Lat. of British Museum, 392 ff.
 note on an unregarded MS. of, 392 ff.
 on the fragments of an Epitome of, 290 ff.
 Locust-plague in Africa of 125 B.C., a modern parallel, 394 *f*.
 Lycurgus (king), 82*a*

M.

MacDonald (C. M.), the citations from Sallust's *Historiae* in Arusianus Messius, 155 *f*.
McDowall (K. A.), notice of Scott's *Portraits of Julius Caesar*, 183 ff.
 date of Seilanian, 229 ff.
McElderry (R. Knox), some notes upon Roman Britain, 398 *f*, 458 ff.
Madan (Falconer), Uncial or Uncial? 48 *f*.
 Manuscript problem in the *Silvae* of Statius. Ad-dendum, 43*a*, *b*
 Manuscripts, classical, in Turin library, catalogue of, 335*a*
 MS. of *The Thebaid*, the St. John's College (Cambridge), 38 ff.
Maidment (H. J.), Horace, *Ars Poetica*, vv. 125 foll., 441 *f*.
 Manchester, local classical association founded at, 429*b*
 Mars as specialised form of Jupiter, 375*a*
Marshall (F. M.), Monthly Record, 141 ff., 188 ff., 235 *f*, 284 *f*, 332*a*, *b*, 376 ff., 424 *f*.
 notice of Ronczewski's *Roman Vault-Decoration*, 234*a*, *b*
 notice of Talfourd Ely's *Roman Hayling*, 283 *f*.
 Martial viii. 32 ad fin., English version of, 465*a*
 Mason's *Compositions and Translations*, noticed, 464 *f*.
 Matritensis of Manilius and Matritensis of Silvae, handwriting of, 43*a*, *b*
 Mavortius' Copy of Prudentius, 112 ff.
 recension of Horace, 115*a*, *b*
Meaning of ἐπὶ τῇ σκηπῇ, Flickinger's, noticed, 179*b*
 Meillet's *Introduction à l'étude comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes*, noticed, 465*a*, *b*
 Menna's *De Infinitivis apud Plinium Monarchi usum*, noticed, 18*a*, *b*
 Merrill's *Selections from the Younger Pliny*, noticed, 173 *f*.
 Metrical division of compound words in Virgil, 288 ff.
 Miletus, discoveries in, 376 *f*.
 Minucius Felix, and Plato, 302 *f*.
 Octavius, Boenig's, noticed, 51 ff.
 Brodrick's translation of, noticed, 54 ff.
 Walzing's ed. of, noticed, 269 ff.
Mittheilungen der Altertums-Kommission für Westfalen, noticed, 332*a*
Modal Attraction, Antoine's, noticed, 411 *f*.
 MONTHLY RECORD, 141 ff., 188 ff., 235 *f*, 284 *f*, 332*a*, *b*, 376 ff., 424 *f*.
Monumenta Palaeographica, Chroust's, noticed, 225 *f*.

Moulton (J. H.), grammatical notes from the Papyri, 106 ff., 151 ff.
Moulton's Two Lectures on the Science of Language, noticed, 64a, b
Murray's Euripides, noticed, 463 f.
 Musical concords, Greek, 150 f.
Musici Scriptores Graeci, emendations and discussions, 387 ff.
Mycenaean Troy, Tolman and Scoggin's, noticed, 424b
 Mysteries in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, 416 ff.

N.

Nairn's *Herodas*, noticed 263 ff., 308 ff.
Naylor (H. Darnley), grammatical notes, 206 f., on Sophocles *Antigone*, 259 and 429, 401 f.
 Necropolis, prehistoric, at Rome, 137b, ff.
 Nemorensis Rex, 364b
 Nero, Henderson's, noticed, 57 ff.
 Neuter, notes on the emphatic, 448 ff.
 nominative, 36a
 New Metric, Quantitative difficulty in, 339 f.
 Newcastle-on-Tyne, discoveries in 379a
 Nicaeus's Recension of Juvenal, 129b
Nicklin (T.), notes on the text of Dionysius Halicarnassensis: *The Three Literary Letters*, 260 ff.
 notice of Abbott's *From Letter to Spirit*, 357 ff.
 Nuces Thucydideae, 199a, b
 Nonius Marcellus, Lindsay's ed. of, noticed, 353 ff.
 Norba, discoveries in, 141 ff.
 Norden's *Aeneid* vi, 403 ff.
 NOTES, 49 f., 158 f., 401 f.
 Notes on Aeschylus, 241 ff.
 on the Ancient Greek Sculpture exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts, Club, 133 ff.
 on the *Birds* of Aristophanes, 100 f.
 on Demosthenes, 11 ff.
 on the text of Dionysius Halicarnassensis: *The Three Literary Letters*, 260 ff.
 on Horace, 391 f.
 on an unregarded MS. of Livy, 392 ff.
 upon Roman Britain, 398 f.
 on the Roman *portoria*, 44a, b
 on the Scholia to the *Aves*, 436 f.
 on the *Silvae* of Statius, 156 ff.
 on Tacitus *Agricola*, 33, 2, 43 f.
 on Xenophon, 204 ff.
 Nuces Thucydideae, 199a, b
 Numae Simpuvium, 328b, f.

O.

Oakesmith's *Religion of Plutarch*, noticed, 322a, b
 Oak-gods and oak-kings, 76a, 77a, b, 79a, 80a, 81a, b, 82a, 83a, b, 84b, 85a, b, 88b, 89a
 Offensive weapon in the Pyrrhic, 101 ff.
Oldfather (W. A.), on Euripides *Alcestis* 96-98, 386a, b
ὁμοιομεπεία of Anaxagoras, 217 ff.
 On *Prometheus Desmoetes*, lines 980-1, 99 f.
 On the Ancient Sculptures exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club. Corrections in Professor Furtwängler's Reply, 470a
 On the neuter nominative, some impersonal verbs, and three dramatic quotations, 36 f.
 ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS, 2 ff., 97 ff., 145 ff., 194 ff., 240 ff., 287 ff., 336 ff., 383 ff., 430 ff.
 Oropus, discoveries in, 235b
 Orthography in the *Kourā*, 106b
oscillatio and *oscilla*, 364a

Osuna (Urso), discoveries in, 378 f.
 Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, style and metric of, 428b
Owen (S. G.), notice of Roby's *Roman Private Law* 174 ff.
 Owen's *Persius and Juvenal*. A Rejoinder, 125 ff.
 A Caveat, 227 f.
 Oxford Philological Society, proceedings of, 131 ff., 278 ff., 415a, b, 429b
 Oxylyus, an oak-king, 87a
 Oxyrhynchus Papyri P. iii. pp. 27-80, 18 ff., 193b

P.

πάρας, 79b
 Papyrological Literature, noticed, 402 f.
 Parodos of Sophocles' *Antigone*, 243 ff.
 Parthenon, foundation of, 92a, b
 Pauly's *Real Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Wissowa's, noticed, 228 f.
Peaks (Mary Bradford), Caesar's movements, Jan. 21 to Feb. 14, 49 B.C., 346 ff.
Pearson (A. C.), notice of Diels' *Pre-Socratics*, 217 ff.
 Pergamon, discoveries in, 188 f., 236a, b
 Perrot's *Art in Antiquity* (vol. viii), noticed, 92 ff.
Persius and Juvenal, Owen's. A Caveat, 227 f.
 A Rejoinder, 125 ff.
Peterson (W.), emendations of Cicero's *Verrines*, 23 ff., 208 ff.
 The opening sentence of the *Verrines*, 440 f.
Pétrone: Vœux de la Société Romaine, Thomas', noticed, 229b
Phaedo 96A-102A, and on the δεύτερος πλοῦς 99D, 5 ff.
φύσις, in later Greek philosophy, ambiguity of, 132b
 P(ithoanus) Codex of Juvenal, represents Nicaeus' Recension, 130a
 Pitigliano (S. Etruria), discoveries in, 284a
 Plato and Minucius Felix, 302 f.
 δεύτερος πλοῦς, 5a, f.
 Phaedo 85D, 203b
 Republic, Manuscripts of, 199 ff.
 canons of textual criticism of, 201 f.
 Platonica I., 199 ff.
 Platonica VI., 432 ff.
 Platonist Doctrine of the ἀσύμβλητοι ἀριθμοί, 247 ff.
Platt (Arthur), emendations of Julian *Misopogon*, 21 f.
Pliny the Younger, Selected Letters of, Merrill's ed. of, noticed, 173 f.
 Plural of *res publica*, 37 f., 159a
Plutarch, Religion of, Oakesmith's, noticed, 322a, b
Pocket-book Odes of Horace, noticed, 63a, b
πολυετής, note on, 49b
Porterfield (Clara M.), Ten Commandments for Classical Students, 277 f.
Portoria, note on the Roman, 44a, b
Portraits of Alexander the Great, Schreiber's, noticed, 231 f.
Portraits of Alexander, Ujfalv'y's, noticed, 94 f.
Portraits of Julius Caesar, Scott's, noticed, 183 ff.
Postgate (J. P.), notice of Bell and Sons' *Pocket-book Odes of Horace*, 63a, b
 notice of Gercke's *Abriß der Griechischen Lautlehre*, 63b, 64a
 notice of Housman's *Manilius I.*, 63a
 notice of Klussmann's *Catalogue of School-Programs*, 64b
 notice of Krumbiegel's *Index to Varro's Res Rusticae*, 63b
 notice of Mason's *Compositions and Translations*, 464 f.

Postgate (J. P.)—continued.

- notice of Moulton's *Two Lectures on the Science of Language*, 64a, b
- notice of Rockwood's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Liber Primus et Somnium Scipionis*, 464a
- notice of Wessner's *Donatus*, 224a, b
- on Statius, *Thebaid* ix. 501, 301a, b
- on the neuter nominative, some impersonal verbs and three dramatic quotations, 36 f.
- the Latin future infinitive, 450 ff.
- the Manuscript Problem in the *Silvae* of Statius, 43a, b

Powell (J. U.), notice of Verrall's *Agamemnon*, 212 ff.

'Pozzi rituali,' two, 141a

Praeneste, a derivation of, 362b

discoveries in, 377a, b

Prayers of the Greeks, Ausfeld's, noticed, 423 f.

Prehistoric pottery in base of equestrian statue of Domitian, 328a, f.

Pre-Socratics, Diels', noticed, 217 ff.

Proctor's *Oresteia* of Aeschylus, noticed, 335b

Professor Furtwängler's Methods, 470 ff.

Prohibitions in Greek, 262 f.

Pronunciation of *GN* in Latin, 402b

Prudentius, Mavortius' Copy of, 112 ff.

the spelling of the sixth century M.S. of, 45 ff.

Pseudo-Euclid, *Introductio Harmonica*, 150 f.

Puteanean recension of Statius, *Thebaid*, 40a

Pyrrhic Dance in Art, 104b, f.

the, 101 ff.

Q.

Quantitative difficulty in the new metric, 339 f.

Querquetulani, 362b

Quirinus, 368b, 372b, f.

Quiritis (Curitis), 373a

R.

Rackham (H.), notice of Stuart Jones's *Thucydides*, 216a, b

Radford (Robert S.), notice of West's *Latin Grammar*, 355 ff.

Ramsay (W. M.), notice of Bérard's *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssee*, 165 ff.

notice of Perrot's *Art in Antiquity*, (vol. viii.), 92 ff.

on Juvenal vii. 222, 158b, f.

Ramsay's *Tacitus*, noticed, 407 ff.

Recent excavations in Rome, 137 ff., 328 f.

editions of Plays of Aristophanes, noticed, 164 f.

Reid (J. S.), note on the Roman *Portoria*, 44a, b

on the Fragments of an Epitome of Livy discovered at Oxyrhynchus, 290 ff.

the plural of *res publica*, 159a

Relative attraction in Livy, 206 f.

Reply to a critique on a recent Greek and Latin verse translation, 226 f.

REPORTS, 64 ff., 131 ff., 278 ff., 415 a, b

res publica, plural of, 37 f., 159a

REVIEWS, 50 ff., 115 ff., 159 ff., 212 ff., 263 ff., 308 ff.,

352 ff., 402 ff., 463 f.

Rex Nemorensis, 364b

Rhetorical fragment, new, in relation to the Sicilian

Rhetoric of Corax and Tisias, 18 ff.

Rhodes, discoveries in, 377a

Rhodobates, 230 f.

Richards (Franklin T.), notice of Henderson's *Nero*, 57 ff.

Richards (Herbert), further notes on Demosthenes, 11 ff.

Laertiana, 340 ff.

notes on Xenophon, 204 ff.

notice of Capps's *Introduction of Comedy into the city Dionysia*, 180a

notice of Flickinger's *Meaning of ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ*, 179b

notice of some recent editions of plays of Aristophanes, 164 f.

on Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, i. 6. 13, 288a, Platonica—VI., 432 ff.

Rini (Thessaly), discoveries in, 425a

Roberts (W. Rhys), the new Rhetorical Fragment in relation to the Sicilian Rhetoric of Corax and Tisias, 18 ff.

Roby's *Roman Private Law*, noticed, 174 ff.

Rockwood's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Liber Primus et Somnium Scipionis*, noticed, 464a

Rogers' edition of the *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes, noticed, 164a, b

Roman Britain, notes upon, 458 ff.

Roman Private Law, Roby's noticed, 174 ff.

Roman Vault-Decoration, Ronczewski's, noticed, 234a, b

Rome, discoveries in, 236b, 425a, b

Jupiter at, 364 ff.

Jupiter Feretrius at, 364 f.

recent excavations in, 137 ff., 328 ff.

Triple Jupiter at, 364 f.

Romulus Silvius, 363b

tomb of, 140b

Ronczewski's *Roman Vault-Decoration*, noticed, 234a, b

Rough Castle (Scotland), discoveries in, 379a

Rouse (W. H. D.), Greek and Eastern Parallels to Herodotus iii. 119, 386 f.

notice of Ausfeld's *Prayers of the Greeks*, 423 f.

notice of Miss Harrison's *Greek Religion*, 465 ff.

notice of Oakesmith's *Religion of Plutarch*, 322a, b

notice of Simonson's *A Greek Grammar: Accidence*, 276 f.

notice of Solmsen's *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Illustrandas Dialectos selectae*, 179a, b

notice of Strzygowski's *Der Dom zu Aachen*, 424a, b

notice of Winbolt's *Latin Hexameter Verse*, 180b

rss, Latin *s(s)* from, 159a, b

Ruhl's *De Mortuorum Iudicio*, noticed, 235b

Rutherford (W. G.), the date of the Dionysalexander, 440a, b

S.

Sallust's *Historiae*, citations from, in Arusianus Messius, 155 f.

Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship*, noticed, 271 ff., 316 ff.

Sanskrit root *teig-*, Greek cognates of, 207 f.

Sargeaunt (J.), on Juvenal i. 144-145, 49 f.

Sauer's *Labours Head and Parthenon Pediments*, noticed, 282a, b

Schreiber's *Portraits of Alexander the Great*, noticed, 231 f.

Science of Language, Two Lectures on, Moulton's, noticed, 64a, b

Scott (J. A.), Homeric Notes, 145 ff.

Scott's *Portraits of Julius Caesar*, noticed, 183 ff.

Seaton (R. C.), notice of Brodribb's Translation of Minucius' *Octavius*, 54 ff.

- Secrecy in voting in the Athenian Law Courts in the Fifth Century B.C., 456 ff.
 Seilanion, date of, 229 ff.
Seneca Rhetor, Bornecque's, noticed, 221 f.
Septem c. Thebas and Persae of Aischylos, Sidgwick's, noticed, 159 ff.
Set in Latin MSS., corruptions of, 302a, b
Shilleto (W. F. R.), note on Aristophanes, *Wasps* 565, 49a
 Shirley's 'No Armour against Fate', Greek version of, 181a, b
Shorey (Paul), Plato and Minucius Felix, 302 f.
 Shorey's *Unity of Plato's Thought*, noticed, 120 ff.
Short Comparative Grammar, Brugmann's, noticed, 412 ff.
 notices, 331 f., 424a, b
 Sicily, Pelasgian Zeus in, 327b
 Triple Zeus in, 325 ff.
 Sidgwick's *Septem c. Thebas and Persae of Aischylos*, noticed, 159 ff.
 Simonson's *A Greek Grammar: Accidence*, noticed, 276 f.
 Simpuvium Numae, 328b, f.
 Sirens as scandal-mongers, 350 b
Slater (D. A.), Corruptions of *Set* in Latin MSS., 302a, b
 Solmsen's *Inscriptiones Graecae ad illustrandas Dialectos selectae*, noticed, 179a, b
 Some account of a volume of Epigraphic Drawings now preserved in the British Museum, 70 ff.
Sonnenschein (E. A.), the plural of *res publica*, 37 f.
 Sophocles *Antigone* 259 and 429, 401 f.
 Antigone, Parodos of, 243 ff.
 Antigone at the Leland Stanford Junior University, noticed, 178a
 Fragments, *Adversaria* upon, 245 f.
 Sororium Tigillum, 369a
 Source of Dante's *Eunoe*, 50a, b
 Spelling of the Sixth Century MS. of Prudentius, 45 ff.
 St. John's College (Cambridge) MS. of *The Thebaid*, 38 ff.
 St. Louis Exposition, 1.
 Stanitz (Kuban district), discoveries in, 377b
 Statius, *Thebaid* ix. 501, 301a, b
 Thebaid, emendations in, 300 f.
Statuettes, Types of Terracotta, Winter's, noticed, 420 ff.
Stewart (H. F.), notice of Gifford's *Eusebius*, 323 ff.
Stewart (J. A.), the source of Dante's *Eunoe* 50a, b
 Sticks, bundles of, in ritual, 362a (note).
Stobaei excerpta Platonica de Phaedone, Bickel's, noticed, 178 f.
 Stuart Jones's *Thucydides*, noticed, 216a, b
 Studies of Latin words in -cinio-, -cina-, 461 ff.
Sturtevant (E. H.), Latin s(s) from rrs, 159a, b
 Sulmona (Paeligni), discoveries in, 284b
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 95 f., 143 f., 190 ff., 237 f., 285 f., 332 ff., 379 ff., 425 ff., 474 ff.
 American Journal of Archaeology, 190b, 333a, b, 425b
 American Journal of Philology, 330 f., 474a
 Annual of the British School at Athens, 379 f.
 Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, 334a
 Hermathena, 474a
 Jahrbuch des Archaeologischen Instituts, 191a, b; 425 f.
 Jahresheft des österreichischen archäol. Institutes, 285b
 Journal international d'archéologie numismatique, 144b
 Journals of Hellenic Studies, 190a, b, 332 f.
 Mnemosyne, 192a, 381b, 428b
 Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc., 95a, b, 192a, 238a, b, 334b, 381 f., 429b, 475a
 Numismatic Chronicle, 143b, 144a, 285a, b, 427a, 474 f.
 Numismatische Zeitschrift, 427a
 Revue belge de Numismatique, 237 f.
 Revue de Philologie, 95a, 475 f.
 Revue numismatique, 144a, b, 238a, b, 333 f., 427a, b
 Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 191 f., 334a, b, 382b, 475a, b
 Rivista italiana di Numismatica, 144a, 237b
 Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 95 f., 192a, b, 286a, b, 381a, b, 427 f.
 Zeitschrift für Numismatik, 285b
Summers (W. C.), notice of Bornecque's *Seneca Rhetor*, 221 f.
 notice of Menna's *De Infinitivi apud Plinium Minorem usu*, 180a, b
 notice of Merrill's ed. of *Selected Letters of the Younger Pliny*, 173 f.
 notice of Norden's *Aeneid* vi, 403 ff.
 Sunium, discoveries in, 235b
 Svoronos's *National Museum of Athens*, noticed, 233 f.
 Syntax in Greek Papyri, 151 ff.
 Nouns concord of, 151a, b
 cases of, 151b, ff.
 accusative, 152a, b
 dative, 153a, ff.
 genitive, 152b, f.
 nominative, 151b, f.
 adjectives and pronouns, 154 f.
 superlative, 154a, f.
 comparison, 154a, f.
 position of adjective, 154a
 'duality', 154b
 relatives etc., 154b
 Syracuse, discoveries in, 285a

T.

- Tacite*, Boissier's, noticed, 223 f.
 Tacitus, *Agricola*, 33, 2, 43 f.
 Ramsay's, noticed, 407 ff.
 Virgil imitated by, 43b
 Tantalus, suspended stone of, 320a
 Ten Commandments for Classical Students, 277 f.
 Terminations, corruption of Greek, 342b, ff.
 Thalheim's *Isacus*, noticed, 115 ff.
Thesmophoriazusae of Aristophanes, date of, 164b
 Thiersch's *Zwei antiken Grabanlagen bei Alexandria*, noticed, 331 f.
 Thomas's *Pétrone, l'envers de la Société Romaine*, noticed, 229b
Thompson (John), the epistolary tenses in Greek, 402a, b
Thucydides, Stuart Jones's ed. of, 216a, b
 Tisias, 18 f.
 Tomb of Romulus, 140b
 'Tophanes Taylori', 118b
 Tragic fragments, on some, 430 f.
 Triopas, 76 f.
 Tripolis, discoveries in, 378a
 Troy, Dorpfeld's, noticed, 181 ff.
Tacker (T. G.), further *Adversaria* upon the Fragments of Sophocles, 245 f.
 Adversaria upon *Fragmenta Tragicorum Aesopota*, 431 f.

Tucker (T. G.)—*continued*.

- Adversaria* upon the Fragments of the Minor Tragedians, 383 ff.
Further *Adversaria* upon the Fragments of Euripides, 194 ff.
the Mysteries in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, 416 ff.
Tully and Cicero regarded as two separate persons, 318b
Tunica retiarum, 395 ff.
Tunis, discoveries in, 378a, b
Turin Library, catalogue of classical MSS. in, 335a
Library, fire at, 193b
Twelve Tables, authenticity of, 133a, b

U, V.

- Ujfalv'y's *Portraits of Alexander*, noticed, 94 f.
Umbro-Sabellian states, Jupiter in, 374 f.
Uncial or Uncinal? 48 f.
Unity of Plato's *Thought*, Shorey's, noticed, 120 ff.
Vahlen's *Ennius*, noticed, 169 ff.
Van Leeuwen's ed. of the *Aves*, *Lysistrata*, and *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes, noticed, 164 f.
Varro's *Res Rusticae*, Krumbiegel's Index to, noticed, 63b
Vedjiovius, 366b
Venetus A of Homer, character of, 149a
Verbs in -μ in Greek papyri, 111b, f.
Verbals in -τέος, -τος, 112b
in -τος, 23a, b
Verrall (A. W.), metrical division of compound words in Virgil, 288 ff.
Verrall's *Agamemnon*, noticed, 212 f.
Verrines, opening sentence of, 440 f.
VERSIONS, 69 f., 181a, b, 416a, b
Virgil imitated by Tacitus, 43b
Vocative of *Θεός*, 158a
Von Mach's *Greek Sculpture*, noticed, 375 f.
Voting in the Athenian Law Courts, 456 ff.

W.

- Waldstein (Charles)**, Professor Furtwängler's methods, 470 ff.
some notes on the ancient Greek sculpture exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, 133 ff.
Walters (H. B.), Archaeological Summaries, 190 f., 237a, b, 332 f., 379 f., 425 ff.
Associate Editor for Archaeology, 70
notice of Collignon's and Couvé's *Catalogue of Painted Vases at Athens*, 376a, b
Tolman and Scoggin's *Mycenaean Troy*, 424b
Winter's *Types of Terracotta Statuettes*, 420 ff.
Short Notices, 331 f.
Walter's *Greek Art*, noticed, 282 f.
Walters (W. C. F.), note on an unregarded MS. of Livy, 392 ff.
Walzing's *Minucius Felix*, noticed, 269 ff.

- Warren, statuette of Herakles, 137 ff.
Warren (Minton), notice of Lindsay's *Nonius Marcellus*, 353 ff.
Wessner's *Donatus*, noticed, 244a, b
West's *Latin Grammar*, noticed, 355 ff.
Wheeler (Benj. Ide), Parodos of Sophocles' *Antigone*, 243 ff.
White (John Williams), notes on the scholia to the *Aves*, 436 ff.
White (R. E.), two notes on the *Birds* of Aristophanes, 100 f.
Wiegand's *Archaic Poros-Architecture of the Acropolis*, noticed, 232 f.
Wilson (J. Cook), *Musici Scriptores Graeci*. Emendations and discussions, 387 ff.
Pseudo-Euclid, *Introductio Harmonica*, 150 f.
on the Platonist doctrine of the ἀσύμμετροι ἀριθμοί, 247 ff.
Winbolt's *Latin Hexameter Verse*, noticed, 180b
Winstedt (E. O.), Mavortius' copy of Prudentius, 112 ff.
the spelling of the sixth century MS. of Prudentius, 45 ff.
Winter's *Types of terracotta statuettes*, noticed, 420 ff.
Wissowa's *Pauli's Real Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, noticed, 228 f.
Wroth (W.), summaries of Numismatic periodicals, 143 f., 237 f., 285a, b, 333 f., 417a, b
Wyse (W.), notice of Thalheim's *Isacus*, 115 ff.

X.

- Xanthus, triple deity of, 75
Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 1. 6. 13, 288a, b
Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, on a passage in, 260a, b
notes on, 204 ff.

Z.

- Zeta* and other consonants in classical Attic, pronunciation of, 132a
Zeus Ἰδαίος, 77 f.
at Cnidos, 76 f.
at Troy, 77 f.
Βαγῆος, 79a, b
Βροτῶν 79b, 80b
Ἐρκεῖος, 77 f.
Jupiter, and the Oak, 75 ff., 325 ff., 360 ff.
head of, No. 46, in Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition, 133b, f. 419a.
in Central Greece, 83 ff.
in Lycia, 75 f.
in Northern Greece, 80 ff.
in Phrygia, 79
in Phrygia Minor, 78 f.
in Southern Greece, 87 ff.
Λυκαῖος, 87 ff.
moral development of, in Aeschylus, 99a, f.
Ζηράτιος, 79b, f.
triple, Cyclops as a, 325 f.
in Sicily, 325 ff.
of Harpy tomb from Xanthus, 75 f.

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note.—References to the Orators are given by name of speech and section, to Aristotle by the paging of the Berlin edition, to Cicero by section, to Plato by Stephanus' paging, to Plautus and Terence by the continuous numeration.

A.

- Achaens :—
fr. (3), 385*a*, *b*; (27), 385*b*
 Aeschines :—
in Ctes. (130), 177*a*
 Aeschylus :—
Ag. *passim*, 215*a*, *b*; (71, 219, 653), 242*a*; (813 *sgg.*), 457*a*; (1146), 215, *b*; (1181), 242*a*; (1321), 432*b*; (1418), 242*a*
Cho. (154, 245, 284, 316, 491, 835, 863), 242*a*; (999), 242*b*
Eum. (213, 338, 484, 485, 667*b*), 242*b*; (735, 744 *ff.*), 456*b*; (941, 947), 242*b*
Persae (13, 93 *sgg.*), 161*b*; (95 *sq.*, 97 *sgg.*), 162*a*; (131 *sgg.*, 135), 162*b*; (275, 283), 163*a*; (381 *ff.*), 98*b*; (428, 568, 616), 163*a*; (638), 241*a*; (879 *ff.*), 162*b*; (887), 163 *b*; (893), 241*a*; (900, 926, 945), 163 *b*; (1005, 1053), 241*a*
P. V. (445, 580, 738), 241*a*; (926-7), 100*a*; (980, 1), 99 *f.*
Suppl. (121, 171), 241*b*; (244), 101*a*; (249, 327), 241 *b*; (568), 241 *f.*; (607 *sq.*), 457*b*; (790, 901, 1012), 242*a*
Theb. (55, 109), 241*a*; (116, 134), 160*a*; (151), 241*a*; (205, 251), 160*a*; (299), 241*b*; (428), 160*a*; (433), 160*b*; (473, 547, 624), 241*b*; (653), 160*b*; (783 *sq.*), 161*a*; (788), 161*a*; 241*b*; (1030), 161*b*
fr. (258), 243*a*
 Agathon :—
fr. (5), 195*b*; (29), 385*b*
 Alcidas :—
Soph. (13), 19*a*
 Alexis (263, 5), 430*a*
 Anaxilas (22, 18), 315*a*
 Anaxippus (*ap. Ath.* 404 C), 266*b*
 Apuleius :—
Apol. (c. 22=p. 30. 23, de Vliet), 445*a*; (c. 24=p. 32. 16, c. 41=p. 54. 18, c. 63=p. 79. 18), 445*b*; (c. 64=p. 80. 21, c. 84=p. 102. 5, c. 90=p. 109. 9), 446*a*; c. 102=p. 124. 10), 446*b*
Florid. (c. 16=p. 170. 15), 446*b*
De deo Socrat. (c. 6=p. 11. 5, Goldbacher, c. 11=p. 14. 14), 447*a*
De Platone et eius dogm. ii. (c. 22=p. 97. 10, Goldb.), 447*b*

Apuleius—continued.

- Met.* (iv. c. 23=p. 85. 14, de Vliet), 442*a*; (vi. c. 16=p. 129. 20), 442*b*; (vi. c. 26=p. 137. 7, vii. c. 7=p. 147. 6), 443*a*; (c. 14), 452*b*; (vii. c. 18=p. 155. 12), 452*b*; (vii. c. 19=p. 156. 13, c. 21=p. 157. 7), 443*b*; (vii. c. 23=p. 158. 13, viii. c. 10=p. 171. 7, c. 23=p. 180. 25), 444*a*; (ix. c. 14=p. 198. 18, c. 22=p. 205. 11, c. 37=p. 216. 20), 444*b*; (xi. c. 30=p. 276. 19), 445*a*
 Aristophanes :—
Ach. (633, 634), 20*a*
Av. (15-16), 100 *f.*, (396, 468, 718), 165*a*; (753), 165*b*; (842), 165*a*; (857-861), 101*a*, *b*; (1247), 165*a*
Lys. (312, 449, 579), 165*a*; (558), 102*b*; (988, 1099, 1150, 1273 *sgg.* and 1299 *sgg.*), 165*a*
Nub. (60), 308*b*; (987), 104*a*
Ran. (324, 340 *sgg.*, 354 *sgg.*), 417*a*; (650), 418*b*
Thesm. (21, 23), 165*a*; (80), 164*b*; (163), 164*a*; (811, 857), 165*a*; (967, 984, 987, 1041), 164*a*
Vesp. (565), 49*a*; (987 *sgg.*), 456*b*
 Scholia to the *Aves* (1, 13, 31, 66), 436*a*; (68, 96, 102), 436*b*; (107, 109, 129, 149), 437*a*; (167, 189, 267, 299), 437*b*; (303), 438*a*; (450), 438*a*, *b*; (465, 476, 484, 501), 438*b*; (521, 574, 639), 439*a*; (648, 701, 767, 778), 439*b*; (793, 800, 807), 440*a*; (822), 440*a*, *b*
 Aristotle :—
de An. (II. vii. 418, b 14), 131*a*
de Mundo (p. 401^b, 8-9), 430*b*
de Sens. (439, a 21, b 12), 131*b*; (439, a 27, 439, b 11), 131*a*; (439, b 12) 131*b*
Eth. (A 6), 17*a*, *b*
Met. (A 6, 987), 6*b*; (987^b, 14), 251*b*; (ix. 991^b, 27), 252*a* note; 252*b*; (B ii. 992^b, 13 *sgg.*, 997^b, 2), 252 note; (999^a, 1 *ff.*), 17*b*; (iii. 999^a, 6), 248*a*, *b*; 254 note; 255 *f.*; (1028^b, 25), 252 note; (A 1071, a 33-b 2, l. 33 *sq.*, 1072, a 32-b 7; l. 34, 1074, a 12-14), 280*b*; (M 1078^a, 9), 250 note; (6, 1080^a, 11), 17*a*, *b*; 247 *f.*; 253*a*; (1080^a, 17), 253*b*; (1080^b, 23), 252 note; (1080^a, 30), 254*a*; (vii. 1081^a, 17 *sgg.*), 255*a*; (1083^b, 33), 250 note; (viii. 1084^a, 3), 254*b*; (ix. 1086^a, 2 *sgg.*), 257*a*; (1086^a, 6 *sgg.*), 252*b*; (1086^a,

Aristotle—continued.

10), 252a; (iii. 1091a, 10), 254b; (N 1088b, 29), 257b; (1090b, 32), 252b; (1090b, 32 sqq., vi. 1093b, 21), 257a
Nic. Eth. (I. vi. 1096a, 17), 247 f.; 255a, b
Pol. (1276, a 35), 278a
Soph. El. (183 B), 18b

Aristoxenus:—

Harmonica i. (p. 16, Meibohm), 391b; (p. 20, 27), 150b; (p. 22), 391b; ii. (p. 38), 391a; (p. 50), 388a; iii. (62, 5), 390b; (p. 74, 10), 387a

Astydamas:—

fr. (3), 384a; (8), 384a; 430a

Ἀστυδάμας Πολιτεία (67-68), 337 ff.

Athenaeus (121 E), 303b; (281 E), 383a; (629 C), 101a; (631 A, 631 C), 103b

Augustinus:—

Civ. Dei. (3. 31), 394b

B.

Bacchius:—

Introductio (§ 20), 388b; (§ 21 sqq.), 390a; (§ 25), 388 f.; (§ 27), 389a; (§§ 32, 33), 388b; (§§ 39, 43), 389a; (§ 65a), 390 f.; (§§ 75, 82), 389a

Bechtel:—

Ion. Insch. (18, 17), 98a

C.

Caesar:—

B. C. i. (12, 3), 346b; (15, 3), 347b; (16, 1), 347 f.; iii. (69), 279a

Callimachus:—

ad Dianam (240 ff.), 103a
ad Iovem (52), 103a

Capitolinus:—

Vit. Pert. (c. 7 § 6), 44b

Carcinus:—

fr. (8), 384a; (vv. 5 sqq.), 383 f.

Catullus iii. (1, 2), 449a; ix. (10, 11), 448b; (lxiv. 104; xlvii. 2), 352b; (lv. 29), 352 f.; (lvii. 7), 353a

Attis, 227a

Chaeremon:—

fr. (1), 383a; (10), 197a; (25) 383a, b; (36), 383b; 430a, b

Cicero:—

ad Att. vi. (3, 8), 209a; vii. (19), 346b; (24), 348b; viii. (12 B. 1, 12 C. 1), 348a; Caesar ap. (ix. 16), 449a

Brut. (46), 18a

de Fin. ii. (14), 37a, b; ii. (55), 450a

de Nat. Deor. ii. (149), 280a

de Off. i. (133), 280a

de Orat. iii. (43), 280a

Div. in Cacc. i. (§ 1), 440a

in Cat. i. (18), 449a

Laelius (*de Am.*), (50), 449a

Rep. iv. (6), 402b

Phil. ii. (44), 397b; vi. (4), 351a; xii. (7), 36b

Tusculan Disputations i. (7, 14), 449b; iv. (35), 37b

Verrines, II. ii. § 4=p. 201, 13 of Mueller's Teubner text. (§ 16), 23b; (§§ 17, 19, 27, 31, 36), 24a; §§ 40, 54, 55, 102=236, 11, 114), 24b; (§§ 121, 129, 137, 155=255, 12), 25a; (§ 187=267, 37), 25b; iii. (§ 3=p. 271, 22), 25b; (§§ 4, 25, 62, 66, 67), 26a; (§§ 69, 146=p. 329, 9, 185=p. 346, 2, 206=p. 354, 18), 26b; iv. (§ 3=p. 365), 209b; *ib.* 209 f.; (§§ 9, 13, 19), 210a; (§ 26), 210a, b; (§§ 67=p.

Cicero—continued.

391, 19, 75), 210b; (§ 79), 210 f.; (§§ 90, 123=p. 416, 6), 211a; (§ 127), 211a, b; (§ 144), 211b; v. (§ 16=p. 434, 27), 211b; (§ 20), 211 f.; (§§ 93=p. 463, 6, 100), 212a; (§ 113=p. 470, 18), 212a, b; (§ 117=p. 471, 17), 212b

Corp. *Gl. L.* (v. 317, 21), 354a

I. L. (iii. 11918), 459a; (vii. 187), 461b; (vii. 189), 398a

I. R. (1033), 398a

Critias:—

fr. 384 f.

D.

Democritus, (*Frag.* 272, Diels), 145 f.

Demosthenes:—

Androtion (28, 35, 38, 76), 14b

Aristocrates (26, 33), 14b; (50, 143, 145), 15a

Aristogeiton A, (13), 15b; (16, 25, 31, 57, 66, 100), 16a

Aristogeiton B, (4), 16b; (16, 23), 17b

de Corona (§ 216), 176b

de Falsa Leg. (10, 12, 16, 29), 12a; (46, 53, 61, 178, 193, 224, 272), 12b; (295, 297, 303, 310, 329, 336, 339), 13a

de Rhod. Libertate (15, 27), 12a

de Symmoritis (14, 36), 11a, b

Leptines (15), 13a; (20, 24, 93, 123, 157), 13b

Midias (52, 75), 13b; (78, 174, 209, 220), 14a

Pro Megalopolitanis (19), 12a

Timocrates (41), 15a; (53, 61, 105, 141, 171), 15b

Dicaeogenes *fr.* (1), 383a

Diogenes Laertius:—

Proem. (13), 344b; i. (7), 345b; (26), 345a; (27), 341a; (29), 344b; (30), 345a; (48), 341a, 342b; (59), 346a, b; (62), 342b; (64), 345a; (73), 344a; (74), 342a; (77), 341b; (85), 345a; (101), 342a; (102), 345a, 346b; (104), 343a; (107), 345a; (113), 344b; (116), 344a; (122), 344b; ii. (11), 343a; (13), 344a; (15), 344b; (24), 341a; (30, 33, 34), 342a; (35), 341a; (37), 345a; (41), 344a; (43), 342a, 343a; (50), 344b; (66), 341b, 343a, b; (68), 341b; (73), 344b; (74, 76), 341a; (95), 341b, 345a; (96, 103, 114), 343a; (134), 343b; (137), 342a; iii. (18), 343b; (29), 345b; (30), 346b; (45), 341a, 344a; (51), 342a; (56), 342b; (61), 342a; (69, 78), 344b; (103), 342a; (107), 343b; iv. (3), 342b; (4), 345b; (8), 342b; (16), 345a; (47), 342a; (48), 343a; (52), 343b; (60), 342a; (62), 341b; v. (1), 341b, 345b; (2), 341b; (20), 343b; (21), 341a; (31), 342a, b; (32, 33), 344 f.; (36), 345b; (54), 343b; (57), 346b; (58), 343b; (65), 345a; (66, 83), 344a; (91), 345a; (*Antisthenes*) vi. (7), 344b; (10), 343a, 344b; (11), 345b; (14, 23), 342a; (32), 344a, b; (35), 343a; (38), 341b; (50), 341a, 343a; (52), 342b; (54), 344b; (66, 68, 70), 343b; (96, 99), 343a; (*Zeno*) vii. (2), 344a; (3), 341b; (5), 344b; (7, 14), 343a, b; (17), 342b; (19), 341 f.; (20), 345b; (22), 343a; (24), 345a; (25), 343b; (34), 344a; (85), 343b; (86), 345 f.; (169), 343b; (181), 344a; (189), 343a; viii. (13), 343b; (34), 342a; (46), 345a; (57), 20b; (58), 345b; (66), 341b; (68), 342b; (75), 344a; (85), 344b; ix. (6), 341b; (13, 18), 343b; (43), 344b; (51), 343b; (56), 342 f.; (61), 342b; (62), 341b; 73, 104), 345b; x. (119, 126), 343a; (126), 344b

Diogenian vi. (30), 309a

Dionædes iii. 104b

Dionysius Halicarnassensis:—

Ant. (ii. 70), 103b

de Imitat. (ii. 8), 19a

de Lysia (c. 7), 19b

The Three Literary Letters. *ad Ammæum*

II. (p. 793), 261a, b; *ad Cn. Pompeium*
(p. 751), 260a, b; (p. 762), 262b; (p. 780),
260 f.; (p. 784), 262b

E.

Ennius:—

Annals i. (2) 171b, f.; (40), 172a; (49), 171b;

(67), 279 f.

Hecuba iv. 172b

Eubulus II. (p. 202 K), 268b

Euripides:—

Alc. (96-98), 386a, b; (280-325), 336a, b

Andr. (936), 350b; (1135), 104b

H. F. (149, 339), 316 (n.)

Hippol. (653), 302b

I. T. (291), 406a

Phoen. (107-118, 128-139), 2a, b; (1164), 402a

Rhes. (527 sq.), 305a

fr. (*Nauck* 21, 6), 195a; (118, 188), 194a;
(204), 196b; (206, 4-6), 194a; (221), 194a, b;
(243, 266), 194b; (274), 197a; (303, 3-5,
319), 194b; (346), 194 f.; (354), 195a; (360),
195a, 246 f.; (361, 378), 195a; (405),
195a, b; (518, 521, 617), 195b; (527),
195 f.; (550), 196a; (567), 196a, 246a, b;
(580), 196a, b; (578, 608), 196b; (618),
196 f.; (644, 650, 714), 197a; (659), 196b;
(717, 754), 197a; (773), 197a, b; (774),
197b; (775), 305a; (781, 52-54, 795, 4 sq.),
197b; (801, 2-3), 247a, b; (842), 197b;
(853, 2), 197 f.; (890, 900, 919, 930, 982,
986), 198a; (1032, 1054), 198b; (1061), 384b;
(1066, 1115), 198b

F.

Festus (206 M), 159a

G.

Gaudentius, *Introductio Harmonica*, (ch. 18), 387 f.

Gellius:—

Noct. Att. (i. 7), 453a; (iii. 3. 1), 454a; (x.
24), 209a [*Cn. Mattius* in].

H.

Heliodorus:—

Aethiop. ii. (19), 49a; x. (25), 49b

Herodas:—

i. (7), 265b; (10), 265 f.; (18, 19, 28, 29, 42),
266a, b; (61), 266 f.; (66), 267a; (73),
267a, b; (78), 267 f.; (82) 263a; ii. (1), 268a;
(8), 265a; (21), 264b; (44), 268a; (60), 269a;
(78), 265b; (87), 269b; iii. (7, 9, 11), 308a;
(17) 315b; (33), 308a, b; (50), 308b; (54), 315f;
(55, 60), 308 f.; (77), 309a; (80), 263b; (95),
309a, b; iv. (4, 28), 309b; (33), 309 f.
(46, 56), 310a; (67, 73, 77), 310b; (93),
310 f.; v. (4), 311a, b; (5), 311b; (17),
311 f.; (40), 312a, b; (50, 52, 72), 313a;
(77), 313a, b; (84), 313 f.; vi. (15), 314a;
(30), 314a, b; (41), 314b; (51), 314 f.;
(55, 68, 80, 89, 95), 315a; vii. (8-10), 263b;
(21, 28), 315b; (46), 316a; (69), 263a; (72),
265b; (74), 316a, b; (88), 264b; (96), 287 f.,
316b; (128), 316b

Herodian ii. (c. 4 § 7), 44a

Herodotus iii. (119), 386 f.; vi. (129), 103b; viii.
(2.1), 97 f.

Hesiod, *fr.* (ap. Schol. Pindar P. iii. 48), 101b

Hippothoon *fr.* (6), 384b

Homer:—

Iliad i. (394), 227a; v. (127 sqq.), 240 f.; vii.
(433), 304a; xvi. (617), 103a; xxi. (242 sqq.),
301a, b

Odyssey ii. (56), 426a; iv. (95 ff.), 145a; iv.
(707 ff.), 146a; v. (272), 227a; xvii. (344),
98b; xxiv. (215), 462a

Horace:—

C. I. i. (36), 392a; ii. (21-24), 391a; iii. (37),
392a; xii. (41, 45), 392a; xii. (55), 392b; xiii.
(16), 392a; xv. (31), 392a; III. xxvii. (73),
453a.

S. I. vi. (3, 4, 42-44), 392b; ii. i. (37), 349b

Ep. I. i. (64), 392a; ix. (4), 449b; x. (49),
402b

Ars Poetica (125 sqq.), 441 f.

I, J.

Juvenal i. (144-146), 49 f.; ii. (117-142), 395a, b;
(143-148), 396 ff.; vi. (7-13, Oxford fragment),
397a, b; (73, 120), 127b; (197), 128b; (342),
329a; (473), 128b; vii. (41), 302b; (222), 128a,
158b; viii. (122), 129a; (199-210), 396 ff.; (241),
128b; ix. (14), 127b; x. (54), 128a; xiii. (1),
164a; xiv. (229), 128a, 460b

Ibycus 7 (6), 305a

Jerome, Preface to book of Job, 48a

Ion:—

fr. (27, 29, 38), 384b

Isaeus v. (36), 117b

Isaiah xi. 2 (Septuagint), 359a

Julian:—

Misopogon (341 C), 21a; (349 A, ad fin.), 21a;
(350 D), 21b; (353 B, 356 D, 361 C, 366 C),
22a; (369 B), 22b

L.

Libanius *πρὸς Ἀθῶναιον* (p. 358, Reiske), 102b

Livy ix. (43), 330b; (Epitome) xxxvii. (lines
1-6), 291a, f; xxxviii. passim, 291b; xxxix.
passim, 292a, f; xl. passim, 292 f.; xlviii. (ll.
83, 84), 293a, b; xlix. passim, 293b, ff.; l. passim,
294b; li. passim, 295b, ff.; lii. passim, 296b, f.;
liii. passim, 297a, ff.; liv. passim, 297b, ff.;
lv. passim, 298 ff.; lx. 394a, b

Lucan viii. (495), 36a, b, f.

Lucian:—

de lapsu, 49b

dial. deor. (8, 225), 103b

Hermot. (§ 18), 23a; (§ 50), 49b

Lysias viii. (37), 457a

M.

Minnicius:—

Octavius 4. (4), 52b; 5. (9), 53b; 7. (1), 52b;
(3), 8. (4), 55a; 9. (1), 51a; 11. (5), 53a; (9),
55a; 13. (4), 54b, note; (14), 55a, b; (16),
302 f.; 19. (6), 52a; (11), 53b; 21. (6), 52a,
55b; 24. (1), 54a; 26. (12), 52a; 27. (1), 54a;
33. (1), 52b; 34. (1), 53a; (2), 54b; (3), 53a;
40. (4), 53a

Moschion:—

fr. (2), 385b, 430b

N.

- Neophron :—
fr. (2. 10, *Medea*), 384a
 New Testament :—
 1 Cor. xi. (23), 358a
 St. John i. (51), 359a; xii. (27), xviii. (11), 358b
 St. Luke iii. (22), 358a
 St. Mark i. (7), ix. (4), 358a
 St. Matthew xi. (25), 359b
 Nonius Marcellus (p. 67 M), 354 f.; (p. 110, 27 M), 354b; (p. 110 M), 355a; (p. 119 M), 354b; (p. 167), 398b; (p. 179, 18), 462a; (p. 538 M), 354a
 Nonnus *dionysiaca* 28 (292), 103a

O.

- Orosius 5. (11), 394 f.
 Orph. H. 38. (10), 23a
 Ovid :—
Fasti vi. (403), 330a
Met. i. (453), 157a; vii. (404), 157b; viii. (150), 475b; ix. (545), 452b

P.

- Pacuvius ap. Non. 475 (18), 37a
 Pap. Oxyr. (663), 440a, b
 Persius i. (23, 92 ff.), 125 f.; iii. (15 ff.), 126b; (44-46), 126b, f.; v. (8), 127a; (83), 126b
 Petron (9), 398a, b
 Phaenias I. ii. (22), II. v. (19-20), viii. (4), III. vii. (3), xi. (5), IV. xix. (17), 475b
 Philemon (Kock 203; Meineke Incert. cix.) 343 n.
 Philostratus *γymnasticus* (19), 104b
 Pindar :—
Pyth. ii. (127, schol.), 103a
 Plato :—

- Apol.* (20 E, 21 A), 263b
Crat. (436 C *sqq.*), 10b; (409 A), 287b
Gorg. (448 A, C), 433b; (450 B, 456 B), 435b; (458 E), 433b; (465 D), 434a; (469 A), 435b; (472 B), 434a; (478 C), 434a; (480 C), 434a, 435b; (481 C), 203a; (482 B, C, 483 A), 434a; (485 B), 434 f.; (486 C, 492 C), 435a; (495 A-499 C), 10a; (499 A), 435b; (510 B, 512 D, 513 C), 435b
Laches (192 C *sqq.*), 10a
Laues (796 B, C), 103a, 104a; (815 A), 101a, b
Lysias 12 (71), 435b
Meno (77 A), 7a; (86 E), 6b, f.
Parm. (136 A), 10a
Phaedo (66 D), 5a, b; (70 A, 78 C, 80 D), 179a; (86 E, 92 C), 9b; (92 D), 7a; (93 A-94 B), 10b; (94 A), 179a; (96 A-102 A, 99 D), 5 ff.; (100 A, *sq.*), 6a; (101 C, *sqq.*), 8a, f.; (103 B), 5a; (107 B), 7b; (108 D, 112 D), 179a
Phaedrus (243 D), 302b; (273 C), 18b
Phileb. (59 A), 5b; (63 B), 203a
Protag. (327 C, 328 E, 334 A, 341 D), 432a; (353 D), 432b; (355 A, 355 C, 357 A, 360 D, 360 E, 361 C, 311 A, 310 D, 312 D, 328 A, 333 B, 357 E), 433a
Rep. (328 D, 5), 200a, b, n.; (388 E, 6), 261a; (330 C), 202a; (330 E), 202a, b; (331 D), 202b; (333 B), 202 f.; (335 A), 203a, b; (335 A), 10a; (337 C), 203 f.; (346 B), 204a; (349 E), 203b; (476 A), 121b; (476 C), 5a; (477 A, ff.), 121b; (478-534 *passim*), 6b; (505 C), 10a; (579 D), 6b
Tim. (51-2), 121b

Plautus :—

- Amph.* (1133), 451b
As. (364), 452b
Aul. (432), 451b
Bacch. (510), 451b
Capl. (198), 452b; (896), 461a, b; 462a, n.
Cas. (645, 664), 453b
Epid. (284), 452a
Men. (119), 451b
Mil. (698), 451b
Persa (122), 462a; (378), 451b
Pseud. (565), 452a, 455b
Rud. (767), 402b; (871), 452a, n.
Stich. (73), 451b
Trin. (209), 451b
Truc. (400), 453b

Pliny :—

- Nat. Hist.* v. (43, 81) 303b, 304b; vii. (56), 102b

Pliny the Younger :—

- Letters* i. (9, 5), 173a (10, 6, 12, 2, 16, 2), 174a; (18, 4), 173b; (22), 448a; ii. (1, 5, 11, 10), 174a; (13, 8), 173b; (14, 12), 174b; iv. (13, 3), 174a; vii. (24, 7), 174b; viii. (24, 1), 173b

Plutarch :—

- de Exil.* vi. 418b
de Is. et Osir. ch. 47, 50a, b
 Pollux iv. (99), 101b
 Priscian ix. (p. 864), 453b
Prolegomena in Hermogenem (Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* iv. 12), 18a
 Propertius II. vi. (7), 452b; III. xiii. (32), 279b; IV. viii. (58), 279a
 Prudentius, *Peristeph.* ii. (514), 329a
 Pseudo-Euclid. *Introd. Harmon.* c. 4, 388a; c. 8, 150 f.; c. 9, 387a, b; c. 10, 390b; c. 11, 389 f.

Q.

- Quintilian I. 6. (42), 462a
 Quint. Smyrn. x. (310), 311b

S.

- Sannyrrio 1 (I. p. 793 Kock), 430a
 Seneca :—
Apocol. viii. 279b
nat. quaest. vii. 31, (3), 398a
 Seneca Rhetor i (3, 3, 5, 3, 6, 5, 7, 17), 221b; ii. (1, 20), 221 f.; (3, 3, 4, 6), 222a; vii. (pref. 1, 1, 9, 2, 4, 5, 10), 222a; viii. (4 *init.*), 222a, b; (6. *med.*), 222b; ix. (1, 11, 6, 1), 222b
 Solon *fr.* 12, (11), 195a
 Sophocles :—
Ant. (259), 401a, b; (429), 401 f.; (904-920), 386b
El. (149), 306a; (890), 312a
O. T. (929 ff.), 19b
fr. (186), 245a; (197), 197a; (234, 7), 243a, b; (256, 365, 366), 245a; (367, 376, 461, 3), 245b; (463), 245b, 432a; (467, 553), 246a; (583), 431b; (612), 243b; (618, 766), 246b; (811, 818), 246b
 Sosiphanes :—
fr. (2), 385b, 430b
 Statius :—
Silvae I. i. (29 *sqq.*), 139b, f.; i. (83), 302a; ii. (252 *sqq.*), 36b; iv. (39, 40), 156a; (46), 157a; v. (10), 302a; vi. (37), 302a; II. ii. (100 f.), 157b; (147), 158a; iii. (10), 302b;

Statius—continued.

- vii. (55-56), 171 n.; iii. (25), 302b; IV. iii. (19), 302b
Thebaid i. (85-86), 42b; (172), 300a; (347), 452b, n.; (651-653), 42b; (638), 300a; ii. (231, 378-379, 522), 300a; iv. (716), 39a, b; iv. (757, 758), 300b; vi. (551), 300b; (646-648=668-670), 42b; vii. (791 sq.), 453a; ix. (501 sq.), 301a, b; x. (374), 300b; xi. (683), 300b
 Strabo x. (480), 102b
 Suet. *Calig.* (30), 397a

T.

Tacitus:—

- Agr.* (7. 5, 10. 5), 460b; (23. 24), 460a, b; (32. 4), 398b; (33. 2), 43a
Ann. i. (1. 1, 2. 1, 31. 5, 76. 5), 409a; ii. (2. 6), 409a, b; (6. 2, 16. 2, 24. 1), 409b, f.; (28. 3, 41. 5, 47. 1, 54. 2), 410a; ii. (73. 2-4), 408 f.; iii. (3. 3, 17. 5), 410a; (55. 3), 410a, b; iv. (19. 1), 410b; v. (1. 1, 8. 3), 410b; vi. (36. 5), 410b

Terence:—

- Ad.* (87), 354b; (264, 394), 450a; (554), 354b
Andr. (120), 450a; (219, 464), 449a
Eun. (463), 451b
Phorm. (146), 354b; (208), 450a
 Theocritus xiv. 48, *schol. ad.* 343 n.; xiv. (79), 309b
 Theodectes *fr.* (14, 16), 385b
 Theognis (894), 279b; (898-902, 1085, 6), 279b
 Theon on *Arati phenomena* (30), 102b
 Theophrast. *Char.* (38), 314b
 Thucydides i. (2. 6), 199a, b; (10. 1-3), 199b; ii. (11. 7), 199b; viii. (66. 5), 12a

Tragici Graeci:—

- frag. adesp.* (115, 118, 124, 126, 270), 431a; (310, 457, 458, 484), 431b; (507), 432a; (537), 432b

V.

Valerius Flaccus iii. (670), 279a

Varro's *Eumenides* ap. Non. (119, 1 M, 355a, b)Varro *de re rust.* i. (68), 453 f.

Virgil:—

- Aen.* ii. (377), 452b, 453a, n.; iv. (519), 452b, n.; vi. (20), 405 f.; (23, 241, 256, 392), 406a; (394), 405a, b; (396), 406b; (413 sqq., 547, 585 sqq.), 406b; (598), 407a; (740 sqq.), 404a; (780), 407a; (893 sqq.), 407a; x. (426), 453a; (500), 452b; (705), 157b
Georg. ii. (510), 452b; iv. (141), 280a

X.

Xenophon:—

- Anab.* vi. (1. 9), 104a, 106a, b; (1.12), 104a
Cyrogeticus (5.15, 20, 25, 7.11, 9.5, 10.4), 205b; (10.6) 205b; (13.6) 205 f.
de Re Equestri (1.9, 16, 6.2, 8.3, 9.6), 204a; (10.1), 204a, b; (2. 11, 11.8), 204b
Hell. vi. (4, 37), 402a, b
Hipparchicus (1.15), 204b; (4.3), 204 f.; (5.13, 7.10, 14), 205a; (8.4, 9, 14), 205a
Memorabilia i. (6. 13), 288a, b; iii. (8), 10a; iv. 6, (§§ 13-15, 7, § 7), 6a; vi. (13), 260a, b
Symp. ii. (19), 103b

Z.

Zenodotus:—

- fr.* (1), 384b

III.—INDEX VERBORUM.

A.—GREEK.

- ἀβροπευθής, etc. 162b
 ἄγρα, 418b
 ἄγω (on papyri), 111a
 Ἀθῆναι, derived, 86b
 αἰσθάνομαι (on papyri), 111a
 αἰφιλική, 304a
 ἄλως, declension, 109a
 ἄν retained with optative in oratio obliqua, 8b
 ἀναδιπλωσις, 19b
 ἀναπνεῖν, 14a
 ἀντίσκιλλος, 310b
 ἀντὶς, 431b
 ἀνῆλωμα, 110a
 Ἀνθεστήρια, 467a
 ἀντικρυς αἰνεῖν, 384b
 ἀνυπόθετον, τό (Plato) 7b
 ἀπιστάλκα, (epistolary), 206a
 ἀπολλύναι (ἀπώλεσα), 146a
 ἄπωτος, 385b
 -αρχος and -άρχης, 108b
 ἄσπεμος, 430a
 ἄσκρα, onk
 ἀσύμβλητοι ἀριθμοί, 248 ff.
 ἔταλμα, 431a
 ἄτρεπτος, 430b
 αὐτός with μόνος, 195b, 219b
 ἄωτος, 148a
 βαρύπυκνοι, 388a, b
 βαστάζω (on papyri), 111a
 βουλντός 499
 βρόμιος, 468b
 βραίτης, 468b
 γεωμετρία, 259 f.
 γλωσσόκομος, 109a
 γράφω (on papyri), 110a
 δασύνειν 436b
 δεύτερος πλοῦς, 5 ff.
 διάζευξις, 389a
 διαμετρορημένη ἡμέρα, 337 ff.
 διάνοια, (Plato), 6a, b, 258 f.
 διάσια, 466b
 διαφανής, τό (Aristotle), 131a, f.
 δόξα (Plato), 6b
 δύας (ἀρίστος, ὀρισμένη), 254a
 δύναμαι (on papyri) 111a

- E.
 εαυτοῦ (= ἑμμαντοῦ, σεαυτοῦ), 154b
 εἰδητικός ἀριθμός, 257a, b
 εἰκάζειν, 440a
 εἰμί (on papyri), 112a
 εἰρέσται, εἰρηται (plural), 97b, f.
 ἐκπερικίσσαι, 439b
 ἔκπληκτος, 23a,
 ἐκπλήκτως, 23b
 ἐμμετάβολος, 391a, b
 ἐνέργεια, 19b
 ἐνδοκος, 384b
 ἐπάγειν, κύνας, 205b
 ἐπειδή, 432a
 ἔγραψα, ἔπεψα (epistolary), 206a
 ἐπὶ τῆς σκηπῆς, 170b
 ἐπιβαλὼν, 360a
 ἐπιμηθέως, 309a
 ἐπιστάσιος, 360a
 ἐπιχαίρω, (on papyri), 111a
 ἐσσὴν, 355a, b
 ἔστακα, (on papyri), 111b
 ἔτος (ἔτος), 106b
 εὐεπεία, 19b
 ἔφοδοι (= insinuationes), 19b
 ἐχθές, 107a
 ἔως ἄν, 49a
- Θ.
 θεέ (voc.), 109a
 θέλω (on papyri), 111a
 θέλω ἤ, 432b
 θέμα etc., 108a
 θεός, 158a
 θεός, vocative of, 158a
 θεσμός, 467b
 θλῆ, 312b
 θώρηξ, 381b
 θωρήσσειν, 381b
- I.
 Ἰδιος, 154b
 ἱερεῦειν, 462a
 ἱκανόν τι (Platonic), 7b
 -is, -iv, from -ios, -iov, 109a
- K.
 κατακληῖν, 439b
 κατάστασις, 19b
 καπτάγμα, 110a
 κατεργάζομαι (on papyri), 111a
 κέρνος, 304a (n.)
 κηθίς, 268b
 κημός, 268b
 κήρυγμα, 438b
 κηρύλος, 438a
 κερρόχρωτος, 383a
 κλαστομένη, 243b
 κοινεών, 316 (n.)
 Κύκλωψ, derivation of, 326b
- Λ
 λαγχάνω (on papyri), 111b
 Λέπρεον (derivation of), 437a
 Λευκοθέα, 355b
 Λευκοσία, 355b
 λιγός, 303b
 λόγος and νόμος, confusion of, 345a, b
 Λοξίας, 303b
 λοξός, 303b
 λοπαδοφυσητής, 462b
 λύγη, 304b
 Λυκαυγής, 304a, b
- M.
 μέλισσα, 355b
 μεσόπυκνοι 388a
 μεταξὺ, τὰ, 257b, f.
 Μηδόκης, 314b
 μίτρα, 267b
- N.
 νεανίας (in Attic), 200a, (n.)
 νοεῖν, 391b
 νόησις, 8a
 νοητά, 258 f.
 νοῦς, 258 f.
- Ξ
 ξενικός (Rhet.), 20a
 ξιφίζειν, 104a
- O.
 ὄγκος, 430a
 οἶδα (on papyri), 111b
 οἶμαι (at beginning of sentence), 435b
 ὀλλας (for ὀλγος), 107b
 ὀμνυμι (on papyri), 111b
 ὀξύπυκνοι, 388a, b
 ὀπ(π)ῆμος, 308b
 ὀράω (on papyri), 111b
 ὀργή, 310a
 ὀργὴν λαβεῖν, 430 f.
 ὀρνεοπωλίων, 436a
- Π.
 παίζειν, 434b
 παλαιὰ σημασία, 436a
 παραστείχειν, 313a
 πᾶς 'any,' 155b
 πῆμος, 308b
 πίνω (on papyri), 111b
 ποικίλλω, 437b
 πολυετής, 49b
 πράγματα (Plato), 5a
 πράτης, 440b
 προθύειν, meaning of, 382b
 πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον, τὸ (Aristotle), 17, 253 ff.
 προφάσεις ἔλκειν, 311b
 πρύλεις, 103a
 πρὸς and πρῶν, 437a
 πρῶν, 162b
 πυκνόν, τὰ, 388a
 πυρρίχη, 101a, b
- P.
 -pa and -uā with gen. in -ης, 108b
- Σ.
 σαβάζιος, 468b
 σιεῦς, 208a
 Σειληνός, 208a
 Σεῖριος, 207a
 σειρός, 207a
 σείων, 208a
 σιά, 355b
 σιλαίνει, 207b
 σίλλος, 207a, b
 σιληπαρδεῖ, 207b
 σιμὰ γελᾶν, 208a
 σιμός, 207 f.
 Σίμων, 208b
 σίνετα, 208a, b
 σινίον, 208a
 σίνος, 208a, b
 Σίνων, 208a, b
 σιοκόρος, 311a
 σιωκόλος, 311a
 σπᾶν (of magnet), 196a

T.		ὑπατος, 215 <i>a</i>	
		ὑποθέσεις, 9 <i>b</i> , f.	
		ὑποστέλλειν 'omit,' 149 <i>b</i>	
τὰ μεταξύ, 248 ff., 257 ff. (Aristotle)			
τὰ Μικκάλης, 313 <i>a</i>			
τείρα, 207 <i>a</i>			
Τελεσίας, 104 <i>a</i>			Φ.
τελέω (on papyri), 111 <i>b</i>		φέρω (on papyri), 111 <i>b</i>	
τετιμημένος, 207 <i>a</i>		φύσις, 132 <i>b</i>	
τηρός, 101 <i>a</i>			X.
τίνω (on papyri), 111 <i>b</i>			
τίς (relative), 154 <i>b</i> , f.			
τίριος, 207 <i>a</i>		χειρονομία (name of Pyrrhic), 103 <i>b</i>	
τράγος, 468 <i>b</i>		χυτροπωλίων, 436 <i>a</i>	
τραγῳδία, 468 <i>b</i>			Ψ.
τραπεζετίτης, 431 <i>b</i>			
τρισκελές, τὸ (σημεῖον), 326 <i>b</i>		ψελλίζεσθαι, 434 <i>b</i>	
Τ.			Ω.
ύγιής, etc., forms of in the Κοινή, 107 <i>b</i>		ὦς (local), 98 <i>b</i>	
		ὠφελεῖ νόσον, 197 <i>a</i>	

B.—LATIN, ETC.

A.			N.
amo and amabo te, 267 <i>a</i>		nudipedalia, 365 <i>b</i> (n.)	
aquaeclitium, 365 <i>b</i>			
C.			O.
-cino-, -cinea-, Latin words in, 303 ff.		oscillatio, 364 <i>a</i>	
D.			P.
Dea, 370 <i>b</i>		paenitunt, 37 <i>a</i>	
		paenitens not Ciceronian, 36 <i>b</i>	
E.		patrocinari, 349 f.	
		pressus (Rhet.), 280 <i>a</i>	
*cram, old infinitive from root es, 454 <i>b</i>		pudebunt, 36 <i>a</i> , <i>b</i>	
casca 'queen bee,' 355 <i>a</i>			R.
I.		rationari, 349 f.	
Iuvilas (Oscan), 375 <i>a</i>		res publica 'republic,' 38 <i>a</i> , <i>b</i> ; 'public business, 38 <i>b</i>	
L.			S.
		sermocinari, 349 f.	
latrocinari, 349 f.		sia = (θεά), 355 <i>b</i>	
lanterna, 304 <i>a</i> (n.)		stilus, 208 <i>a</i>	
Leucis, 355 <i>b</i>			T.
lurcinabundus, 462 <i>b</i>		tomentum, 462 <i>b</i>	
luscina, 303 ff.		truo, 462 <i>b</i>	
		tubercinari, 462 f.	
M.			U.
manalis lapis, 365 <i>b</i>		uncialis, 48 f.	
mantis-cinatus, 350 <i>a</i>		uaticari, 350 <i>a</i> , f.	
mantiscinari, 461 f.		ut (local), 99 <i>b</i>	
		uis, 128 <i>b</i>	

CORRIGENDA TO THE DECEMBER NUMBER.

- P. 436*a* (note on 1, for 'πειθεταιρ' read 'πειθεταιρ.^v
Ib. (note on 31, l. 2), for 'μὲ' read 'μὴ,' (and l. 3 from end of par.) for 'στρέφῃ' read 'στρίψῃ.'
Ib. (note on 66, l. 4) read 'γεγραμμένον.'
P. 438*b* (note on 484) for 'Μεγαβύζος' read 'Μεγάβυζος.'
P. 439*a* (note on 521 middle) for 'πολὺ γὰρ' read 'note γάρ.'
P. 453*b* l. 16 read 'Sallust Jug. 100. 4' (not 104. 4).

LIBRARY,
UNIVERSITY OF MICH.,
JAN 16 1905

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF JANUARY, AUGUST, AND SEPTEMBER.

Vol. XVIII. DECEMBER, 1904. No. 9.

The Classical Review

Editor: J. P. POSTGATE, 54 Bateman Street, Cambridge.

Associates, England: H. B. WALTERS, British Museum (Archaeology). America:
WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago, T. D. SEYMOUR, Yale University,
and J. H. WRIGHT, Harvard University.

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL AND GENERAL:		ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS (<i>continued</i>):	
Comments and Communiqués	429	Studies of Latin Words in -cinio-, -cinia-.	
ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:		EDWIN W. FAY.	461
On Some Tragic Fragments. W. HEADLAM	430	REVIEWS:	
Adversaria upon <i>Fragmenta Tragicorum</i>		Murray's <i>Euripides</i> . E. H. BLAKENEY . . .	463
<i>Adespota</i> . T. G. TUCKER	431	BRIEFER NOTICES:	
Platonica.—VI. HERBERT RICHARDS . . .	432	Rockwood's <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum</i>	
Notes on the Scholia to the <i>Aces</i> . JOHN		<i>Disputationum Liber Primus et Somnium</i>	
WILLIAMS WHITE	436	<i>Scipionis</i> , Mason's <i>Compositions and Trans-</i>	
The Date of the Dionysalexander. W. G.		<i>lations</i> (J. P. P.); Meillet's <i>Introduction à</i>	
RUTHERFORD	440	<i>l'étude comparative des Langues Indo-</i>	
The Opening Sentence of the <i>Verrines</i> . W.		<i>Européennes</i> (R. S. CONWAY)	464
PETERSON	440	ARCHAEOLOGY:	
Horace, <i>Ars Poetica</i> , vv. 125 foll. H. J.		Miss Harrison's <i>Greek Religion</i> . W. H. D.	
MAIDMENT	441	ROUSE	465
Ad Apuleium. A. J. KRONENBERG	442	On the Ancient Sculptures Exhibited at the	
Notes on the Emphatic Neuter. JOHN		Burlington Fine Arts Club. Corrections	
GREENE	448	in Professor Furtwängler's Reply.	470
The Latin Future Infinitive. J. P. POSTGATE	450	Professor Furtwängler's <i>Methoda</i> . CHARLES	
On Secrecy in Voting in the Athenian Law		WALDSTEIN	470
Courts in the Fifth Century, B.C. JAMES		SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	474
TURNER ALLEN	456		
Some Notes upon Roman Britain (<i>continued</i>).			
R. KNOX McELDERRY	458		

London: DAVID NUTT, 57-59 LONG ACRE.

Boston: GINN AND COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET.

ENTERED AT THE POST-OFFICE AT BOSTON, MASS., AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

Price for Single Numbers, One Shilling and Sixpence (35 cents), except the
February Number, which is Three Shillings (70 cents).
Yearly Subscription (Nine Numbers), Twelve Shillings (\$3.00), or Thirteen Shillings and
Sixpence, Post Free.

GINN AND COMPANY,

Educational Publishers,

LONDON, BOSTON, and NEW YORK,

9 ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON, W.C.

GREEK SCULPTURE: Its Spirit and Principles.

By **EDMUND VON MACH**, recently Instructor in Greek Art in Harvard University.

An interpretation of the spirit of art for the student, the artist, and the general public. Designed to give pleasure and to be of service to the advanced student, who will find therein valuable help for thoughtful study and independent investigation. The one hundred and sixty illustrations are beautifully reproduced in half-tone, and include pictures of the most recent finds in Delphi, Argos, the Islands of the Aegean Sea, and elsewhere.

Large 8vo. 357 pages. Illustrated. 15s. net.

REPRESENTATIVE OPINIONS.

Professor **ERNEST A. GARDNER**, *University College, London*:—(This book) will prove both instructive and suggestive. . . . Both artists and students of archaeology will find many new questions raised, and many old questions viewed in a new aspect."

President **BENJAMIN I. WHEELER**, *University of California*:—"The tone of the book is noble, the information accurate, and the judgment sane."

Professor **H. de FOREST SMITH**, *Amherst College*:—"It is unique in method and style, reliable and illuminating."

THE NATION, *New York City*:—"The author has an excellent knowledge of the facts of his subjects; his training has clearly been admirable, and it has been supplemented by much observation and study on his part."

THE DIAL, *Chicago*:—"Scholarly, sincere, and full of suggestion". The strength, the force, the unity which are shown in the work make one feel that what Mr. von Mach states is authoritative, and his conclusions are worth considering."

THE HARVARD GRADUATES' MAGAZINE:—"Dr. von Mach . . . surveys his subject from the standpoint of the historian and critic of art. . . . Throughout he manifests deep feeling which he has the power of communicating. He is stimulating . . . sympathetic . . . unpedantic."

ALLEN AND GREENOUGH'S NEW LATIN GRAMMAR.

Revised by **J. B. GREENOUGH**, late Professor of Latin in Harvard University; **G. L. KITTREDGE**, Professor of English in Harvard University; **A. A. HOWARD**, Professor of Latin in Harvard University; and **B. L. D'OOGHE**, Professor of Latin in the Michigan State Normal College.

This well-known Latin Grammar, of world-wide reputation, has been revised in every detail to bring it into harmony with the latest results of scholarship and investigation. All the most recent grammatical theories have been considered by the eminent specialists engaged in the work of revision, and if they have not been adopted, it is because the old ones have been thought better. The paragraphs have been rearranged, and the general get-up of the book has been brought as near perfection as possible.

12mo. Half-leather. 490 pages. 5s.

A LATIN GRAMMAR FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

By Professors **W. G. HALE** and **C. D. BUCK**, of the University of Chicago. 388 pages. Price 4s. 6d.

A working text-book for high school and college students, wherein the facts of the language are presented in their true relations one to another.

"We strongly recommend this grammar to the attention of sixth-form masters."—*Journal of Education*.

FIRST YEAR LATIN.

By **WILLIAM C. COLLAR**, Head Master of Roxbury Latin School, and **M. GRANT DANIELL**, formerly Principal of Chauncey Hall School, Boston.

The book provides an average class of beginners with all material necessary for first year's work. Review questions and conversations interspersed, and "Essentials of Grammar" prefixed to every lesson. Copious selections for reading at end of book. xiv+311 pages. Illustrated. Price 4s. 6d.

Teacher's Manual to accompany above. Price 9d.

LISTS SENT POST FREE ON APPLICATION.

BOOKS SENT ON APPROVAL TO TEACHERS.

GINN & COMPANY, 9 St. Martin's Street, Leicester Square, London, W.C.

o
r
y
s

h
as

e,

le

is
ad

he
is

he
he

L.
of
ate

g it
cal
ave
een

ster
NT
cey

ners
ork.
sed,
ery
ok.

ove.

C.

MACMILLAN & CO'S BOOKS FOR CLASSICAL STUDENTS.

PAPERS OF THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME.
VOLUME II.

SIXTEENTH-CENTURY DRAWINGS OF ROMAN BUILDINGS. Attributed to ANDREAS CONER. Reproduced in Facsimile, with a Commentary by T. ASHBY, Jun., M.A., F.S.A., Assistant-Director of the School. Price to Non-subscribers 30s. net; or with a Special Title-page and binding 35s. net.

ROMAN SOCIETY FROM NERO TO MARCUS AURELIUS. By SAMUEL DILL, M.A., Author of "Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire." 8vo. 15s. net. [*Immediately.*]

THIRD EDITION NOW READY.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE GREEK GENIUS. By S. H. BUTCHER, Litt.D., LL.D., late Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo. 7s. net.

HARVARD LECTURES ON GREEK SUBJECTS. By S. H. BUTCHER, Litt.D., LL.D., late Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo. 7s. net.

CONTENTS:—1. Greece and Israel—2. Greece and Phœnicia—3. The Greek Love of Knowledge—4. Art and Inspiration in Greek Poetry.—5 and 6. Greek Literary Criticism.

HANDBOOKS OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.
NEW VOLUME.

A GRAMMAR OF GREEK ART. By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., Lincoln Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Oxford. With Illustrations. Extra Crown 8vo. [*In the Press.*]

A POPULAR HANDBOOK TO THE GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM. Compiled by EDWARD T. COOK. Crown 8vo, limp leather, gilt edges, 10s. net.
CLASSICAL REVIEW.—"Both as a *vade mecum* and as a work of reference it should prove indispensable. . . . We congratulate Mr. Cook heartily on his exhaustive and interesting descriptions of the treasures of the Department."

FLORILEGIUM TIRONIS GRAECUM. Simple Passages for Greek Unseen Translation, chosen with a view to their Literary Interest. By RONALD M. BURROWS, Professor of Greek in University College, Cardiff, and W. C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, Professor of Classical Literature in King's College, London. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

AN ABRIDGED HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE. By ALFRED CROISSET and Professor MAURICE CROISSET. Authorized Translation by Professor G. F. HEFFELBOWER. A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

REDUCED IN PRICE.

ANTHOLOGY OF LATIN POETRY. By PROF. R. Y. TYRRELL, Litt.D. Crown 8vo. Reduced from 6s. to 4s. 6d.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCHOOL CLASSICS. Arranged and Described by G. F. HILL, M.A., of the British Museum. With 29 Coloured Plates. Crown 8vo. Reduced from 10s. 6d. to 6s.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

[To face 2nd page of wrapper.]

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

THE TRAGEDIES OF SOPHOCLES. Translated into English Prose by Sir RICHARD C. JEBB, Litt.D., Regius Professor of Greek and Fellow of Trinity College in the University of Cambridge. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

SOPHOCLES. The Text of the Seven Plays. Edited, with an Introduction, by Sir RICHARD C. JEBB, Litt.D. Crown 8vo, 5s.

THE PLATONIC CONCEPTION OF IMMORTALITY AND ITS CONNEXION WITH THE THEORY OF IDEAS. An Essay which obtained the Hare Prize, 1903. By R. K. GAYE, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP. From the Sixth Century B.C. to the end of the Middle Ages. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt.D., Fellow and Lecturer of St. John's College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge. With Chronological Tables, Facsimiles from Manuscripts and other Illustrations. Crown 8vo. xxiv + 672 pp. 10s. 6d. net.
Spectator.—"As a work of reference his book is of the highest value. The fact that there is no book of a similar character in English, together with the exactitude and extent of the information it contains, make it indispensable to all interested in scholarship."

EURIPIDES. BACCHAE. With Critical and Explanatory Notes, and with numerous Illustrations from works of ancient art. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt.D. *Fourth Edition*. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

CICERO. AD M. BRUTUM ORATOR. A revised text, with Introductory Essays Critical and Explanatory Notes. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt.D. Demy 8vo. 16s.

THE WESTERN MANUSCRIPTS IN THE LIBRARY OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE. A Descriptive Catalogue, by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum. *Now Ready. Vol. IV. containing Plates, Addenda, Corrigenda, and Index.* Royal 8vo. 5s. net.

THE WESTERN MANUSCRIPTS IN THE LIBRARY OF EMMANUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE. A Descriptive Catalogue. By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A. Royal 8vo. 5s. net.

THE CAMBRIDGE GREEK TESTAMENT FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. New Volume. General Editor, F. H. CHASE, D.D., President of Queens' College, Cambridge, and Norrisian Professor of Divinity.

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. Edited by Rev. GEORGE G. FINDLAY, D.D. 3s.

ST. MARK IN GREEK, FOR BEGINNERS.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. The Greek Text. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, for the use of Schools, by Sir A. F. HORT, Bart., M.A. With Two Maps. 2s. 6d.
Educational Times.—"One of the very best editions for schools or for private study."

CAMBRIDGE ENGLISH CLASSICS.

A Series of Editions of Classical English Writers, based upon a Uniform Plan and giving faithful Reproductions of the Original Texts. Prospectus, with Specimen Pages, will be sent on application.

ROGER ASCHAM. ENGLISH WORKS. *Toxophilus, Report of the Affaires and State of Germany, The Scholemaster.* Edited by W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A., Vice-Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Large Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

PITT PRESS SERIES.—New Volume.

TACITUS, HISTORIES. Book III. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Index, by W. C. SUMMERS, M.A., Firth Professor of Classics in the University College, Sheffield. 2s. 6d.

LONDON: C. J. CLAY & SONS, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane,

MR. MURRAY'S NEW BOOKS.

JUST PUBLISHED.

SMALL CLASSICAL ATLAS FOR SCHOOLS.

Edited by G. B. GRUNDY, M.A., D.Litt., Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Author of "The Great Persian War," Editor of "Murray's Handy Classical Maps," &c. Folio 14½ by 9¾ inches. Price 6s.

The Maps in this Atlas incorporate the results of recent scholarship, and have been most carefully prepared so as to accentuate all the chief names and natural features of the countries, and by eliminating those of minor importance to avoid overcrowding. The use of colour contours, whilst displaying the configuration of the countries at a glance, enhances the effect of simplicity, which cannot be achieved in maps where the old-fashioned method of hachured mountains obscured the names. A complete index adds to the utility of the volume, and the low price at which it is published (6s.) brings it within the reach of all Classical Students.

COMPLETION OF THE NEW LIBRARY EDITION OF

THE HISTORICAL WORKS OF JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY.

With Photogravure Illustrations. In 9 Volumes. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. net each.

History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic. 3 Vols.

History of the United Netherlands. 4 Vols.

John of Barneveld. 2 Vols.

No uniform Edition of Motley's Historical Works has ever existed in England, and for many years past the original Library Editions of the earlier works have been completely out of print.

STANDARD DICTIONARIES.

DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES.

INCLUDING THE LAWS, INSTITUTIONS, DOMESTIC USAGES, PAINTING, SCULPTURE, MUSIC, THE DRAMA, &c. Edited by Sir Wm. SMITH, LL.D., Hon. D.C.L., Oxford, Hon. Ph.D., Leipzig; WILLIAM WAYTE, M.A., Late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; G. E. MARINDIN, M.A., Late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Third Revised and Enlarged Edition. With 900 Illustrations. 2 Vols. Medium 8vo, 31s. 6d. each.

CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES.

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and Incorporating the Results of Modern Research. Edited by F. WARRE CORNISH, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. With over 1,100 Illustrations taken from the best examples of Ancient Art. Medium 8vo, 21s.

SMALLER DICTIONARY OF ANTIQUITIES.

Abridged from Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary. With 200 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY AND MYTHOLOGY.

By Various Writers. Edited by Sir WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D. Illustrated by 564 Engravings on Wood. In 3 Vols. Medium 8vo, 84s.

CLASSICAL DICTIONARY OF MYTHOLOGY, BIOGRAPHY, AND GEOGRAPHY.

Compiled from Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionaries. In great part re-written by G. E. MARINDIN, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, some time Assistant Master at Eton College. With over 800 Woodcuts. Thoroughly Revised Edition. 8vo, 18s.

SMALLER CLASSICAL DICTIONARY.

Abridged from the above Work. With 200 Woodcuts. In great part re-written by G. E. MARINDIN, M.A., some time Assistant Master at Eton College. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN GEOGRAPHY.

Illustrated by 534 Engravings on Wood. 2 Vols. Medium 8vo, 56s.

COMPLETE LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

Based on the Works of Forcellini and Freund. With Tables of the Roman Calendar, Measures, Weights, Money, and a DICTIONARY OF PROPER NAMES. By Sir Wm. SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D. Medium 8vo. 22nd Edition. 16s.

COPIOUS & CRITICAL ENGLISH-LATIN DICTIONARY.

Compiled from Original Sources. By Sir Wm. SMITH, D.C.L., and T. D. Hall, M.A. Medium 8vo, 16s.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

[To face last page of Text.]

LIST OF SECOND-HAND COPIES OF THE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS. On sale by **DAVID NUTT, 57-59 Long Acre.**
Continued from No. 7 of the *CLASSICAL REVIEW* for 1904.

- 1376 **POLYAENI** stratagematum libri VIII., gr. et lat., cum notis Is. Casauboni ed. P. Maas-vicius. 8vo. Lugd. Bat., 1690. *Vell.* 4s.
- 1377 — Les ruses de guerre de Polyen, trad. (par D. G. A. Lobineau). 2 vols. 32mo. Paris, 1770. *Cf.* 1s. 6d.
- 1377a **POLYBIUS**, gr. et lat., rec. et ill. J. Schweighauser. — Aeneas Tacticus de toleranda obsidione, gr. et lat., rec. et ill. J. C. Orelli. Together 10 vols. 8vo. Lips., 1789-1818. Fine copy in Russia. £2 2s.
- 1378 — — gr. et lat., illustr. Joa. Schweighauser. 4 vols. 8vo. Oxonii, 1823. *Bds.* 10s. 6d.
- 1379 — et **APPIANI** quae supersunt, gr. et lat., cum indicibus (ed. F. Dübner). Royal 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1839. *Cf.* 9s.
- 1380 — — ex rec. Imm. Bekkeri. 2 vols. 8vo. Berolini, 1844. *Sevcd.* (15s.) 7s. 6d.
- 1381 — Historiarum reliquiae, graecae et latinae cum indicibus. Ed. II. Royal 8vo. Paris, 1859. *Half red morocco.* 15s.
- 1382 — — rec. apparatus critico instr. F. Hultsch. 4 vols. 12mo. Berolini, 1888, 92, 70, 72. (Last editions.) 16s. 6d.
- 1383 — The general history of Polybius, translated from the Greek by Mr. Hampton. 5th Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1823. *Hf. cf.* 5s.
- 1384 — Histoire de Polybe, traduite du Grec par V. Thuillier, avec un commentaire militaire par M. de Folard. 7 vols. 4to. Amsterdam, 1753. Numerous plates. *Cf.* £1 4s.
- 1385 — **CUNTZ** (O.) Polybius und sein Werk. 8vo. Leipzig, 1902. Map. 1s. 6d.
- 1386 — **HULTSCH** (F.) Die erzählenden Zeitformen Polybios. Beitrag zur Syntax der gemeingriechischen Sprache. 3 parts. Royal 8vo. Leipzig, 1891-93. (15s.) 7s.
- 1387 — **KAECKER** (J.) Quaestiones de elocutione Polybiana cum epimetro de hiatu in libris Diodori Siculi. 8vo. 1880. 1s.
- 1388 **POMPEJUS TROGUS**. **GUTSCHMID** (A. von) Über die Fragmente des Pompejus Trogus und deren Glaubwürdigkeit. 8vo. 1857. 1s. 6d.
- 1389 **PORPHYRII** de philosophia ex oraculis haurienda librorum reliquiae, ed. G. Wolff. 8vo. Berolini, 1856. 3s.
- 1390 **PRISCIANI** opera, rec. notisque ill. A. Krehl. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1819. *Sevcd.* 4s.
- 1391 **PROCOPIUS**. Vol. II. (de bello gothico) gr. et lat., ex rec. G. Dindorfii. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1833. *Cf.* 7s.
- 1392 **PROPERTII** Carmina, rec. ill. Ch. Th. Kuinoel. 2 vols. Lipsiae, 1805. *Sevcd.* 15s.
- 1393 — Elegiarum libri IV, rec. novo commentario auxit N. E. Lemaire. 8vo. Paris, 1832. *Hf. Cf.* 5s.
- PROVERBIA** see Gnomai.
- 1394 **PRUDENTII** Carmina, rec. et explicavit Th. Obbarius. 8vo. Tubingae, 1845. 3s. 6d.
- 1395 **PTOLEMAEI** Geographia, gr. et lat., ed. Ch. Müller. Vol. I. in 2 parts (all out). Royal 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1883, 1901. £1 4s.
- 1396 — Atlas of 36 coloured maps to illustrate the above. Folio. Boards, 1901. £3.
- PTOLEMAEUS**—continued.
- 1397 — **RYLANDS** (Tho. G.) The geography of Ptolemy elucidated. Large 4to. Dublin, 1893. 23 plates. *Cf. Privately printed.* 15s.
- 1398 **QUINTILIANI** Opera (institutio oratoria, declamationes maiores et minores) et Calpurnii declamationes cum notis et animadversionibus virorum doctorum ed. P. Burmann. 2 vols. 4to. Lugd. Bat., 1720. *Dutch Vellum.* 10s. 6d.
- 1399 — de institutione oratoria libri XII, rec. et annotatione explicavit G. L. Spalding. Acc. lexicon curante E. Bonnell. 6 vols. 8vo. Lips., 1798-1834. *Sevcd.* (48s.) £1 1s.
- 1400 — Quintilianus et Calpurnius, notis variorum suisque ed. J. J. Dussault. 7 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1821-25. *Cf.* £1 4s.
- Institutio oratoria. Declamationes maiores et minores.
- 1401 — Institutio oratoria, rec. E. Bonnell. 2 vols. in one. 12mo. 1854. *Hf. Cf.* 2s. 6d.
- 1403 — Quintiliani et Calpurnii Declamationes, cum notis doctorum virorum, cur. P. Burmanno. 4to. Lugd. Bat., 1720. *Vell.* 4s.
- 1405 — **DESSAUER** (H.) Die handschriftliche Grundlage der 19 grösseren Pseudo-Quintilianischen Declamationen. 8vo. 1898. 1s. 6d.
- 1406 — **LE BLANT** (E.) Sur deux déclamations attribuées à Quintilien, pour servir à l'histoire de la magie. 4to. 1895. (*Extr.*) 1s.
- 1406a **REI VENATICAE SCRIPTORES** et Bucolici antiqui notis variorum suisque ed. G. Kemper. 4to. Lugd. Bat., 1728. *Vell. Several worm-holes.* 4s. 6d.
- Contains Gratius Faliscus, Nemesianus, Calpurnius, and Caius de canibus britannicis.
- 1407 **ROMANOS**. **KRUMBACHER** (K.) Umarbeitungen bei Romanos. Mit Anhang über das Zeitalter des Romanos. 8vo. München, 1899. 2s.
- 1408 **RUTILII NUMAT**. Itinerarium sive de reditu quae supersunt, notis variorum ed. J. S. Gruber. 8vo. 1804. *Cf.* 1s. 6d.
- 1409 **SALLUSTII** quae extant, cum commentariis integris et selectis variorum. Acc. J. M. Palmerii spicilegia in eundem. 8vo. Amst., H. Boom, 1690. *Rare and esteemed.* 6s.
- 1410 — et **L. A. FLORUS**. 4to. Birmingham, Baskerville, 1773. Russia. *Title-page slightly spotted.* 3s. 6d.
- 1411 — quae exstant opera. Nova editio expurgata. 18mo. Paris, Barbou, 1774. *Calf gilt edges.* 3s.
- 1412 — — rec., varias lectiones variorum suisque commentarios atque indices locupletissimos adiecit F. D. Gerlach. 3 vols. 4to. Basileae, 1823-30. *Half morocco.* (29s.) 9s.
- 1413 — — ex rec. et cum integris annotationibus Th. Cortii et Gerlachi suoque commentario ed. C. H. Frotcher. 3 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1825-30. *Vellum paper. Boards.* (27s.) 9s.
- 1414 — — rec. selectis Cortii notis suisque commentariis ed. indicem adiecit F. Kritz. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1828-35. *Bds.* 6s.
- 1415 — — rec. R. Dietsch. Editio critica. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1859. *Hf. cf. Out of print.* 15s.

SALLUSTIUS—*continued.*

- 1416 — H. Jordan tertium recognovit. Cr. Svo. 1887. 1s. 6d.
- 1417 — Libri de bello Iugurthino partem extremam (103-112), rec. emend. I. Wirz. 4to. 1897. 1s.
- 1418 — Operum reliquiae, ed. F. D. Gerlach. Svo. 1856. Cloth. 1s. 6d.
- 1419 **SAPPHO**. KUBLINSKI (L.) De Sapphus vita et poesi pars I. Svo. 1897. 1s.
- 1420 **SCAENICAE ROMANORUM POESIS** Fragmenta, secundis curis rec. O. Ribbeck. 2 vols. Svo. Lipsiae, 1871. Sewed. £1 3s.
- 1421 **ΣΚΟΜΙΑ**, hoc est Carmina convivialia Graecorum, animadversionibus ill. ed. C. D. Ilgen. 12mo. 1798. 2s. 6d.
- 1421a **SCRIPTORES EROTICI GRAECI** rec. R. Hercher. 2 vols. 12mo. Lipsiae, 1858-59. Boards. £1 1s. The fullest edition.
- 1422 **SCRIPTORES REI RUSTICAE** (Cato, Terentius Varro, Palladius, Columella) per Petrum Victorium ad neterum exemplarium fidem suae integritati restituti. 2 vols. 12mo. Parisiis ex officina Rob. Stephani, 1543. Cf. *Rare*. 10s. 6d.
- 1423 **SCYLACIS** Periplus Maris Interni cum appendice iterum rec. B. Fabricius. Svo. Lipsiae, 1878. 1s.
- 1424 **SCYMNUS**. Fragments des poèmes géographiques de Scymnus de Chio et du faux Dicarque, restitués d'après un MS. de la Bibliothèque Royale par Letronne. Svo. Paris, Gide, 1840. Hf. cf. 5s.
- 1425 **SENECA** (L. Ann.) Opera omnia (philosophica et declamatoria) notis variorum suisque ill. M. N. Bouillot. 6 vols. in 7. Svo. Paris, 1827-32. Hf. cf. £1 1s.
- 1426 — Opera tragica, rec. novisque commentariis illustr. J. Pierrot. 3 vols. Svo. Paris, 1829. Hf. cf. 10s. 6d.
- 1427 — et P. SYRI MIMI singulares sententiae, cum notis J. Gruteri et nova versione graeca Jos. Scaligeri. Svo. Lugd. Bat., 1727. Cf. 4s.
- 1428 — AUBERTIN (Ch.) Etude critique sur les rapports supposés entre Sénèque et Saint Paul. Svo. Paris, 1857. Cloth. 3s. 6d.
- 1429 **SERENUS SAMMONICUS**. KEESÉ (J.) Quomodo Serenus Samm. a medicina Pliniana pendeat. Svo. 1896. 1s.
- 1430 **SEXTI EMPIRICI** opera, graece et latine, notis Henrici Stephani suisque ed. J. A. Fabricius. 2 vols. Svo. Lipsiae, 1840. Sewed, uncut. 9s.
- 1431 — — ex rec. Imm. Bekkeri. Svo. Berolini, 1842. Sewed. 7s.
- 1432 **SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS**, Œuvres en latin avec la traduction française et des notes par J. F. Grégoire et F. Z. Collombet. 3 vols. Svo. Lyon, 1856. Sewed. 9s.
- 1433 — — Epistulae et carmina, rec. et emendavit Ch. Luetjohann. Acc. Fausti et Ruricii epistulae rec. B. Krusch. 4to. Berolini, 1887. Sewed. 16s.
- 1434 **SILIUS ITALICUS**. Panicorum libri XVII, perpetuis commentariis et indicibus ed. N. E. Lemaire. 2 vols. Svo. Paris, 1823. Cf. 7s.
- 1435 **SIMONIDIS CEI** carminum reliquiae, ed. F. G. Schneidewin. Svo. Brunsvigae, 1836. Half brown morocco top gilt. Fine copy. 5s.
- 1437 **SOCRATES**. ALBERTI (E.) Sokrates. Ein Versuch über ihn nach den Quellen. Svo. 1869. 1s. 6d.
- 1438 **SOPHOCLES**, griech. und deutsch mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von J. A. Hartung. 8 vols. 12mo. Leipzig, 1850, 51. (17s.) 7s. 6d.
- 1439 — Tragoediae, ed. Th. Bergk. Svo. 1858. Sd. 1s.
- 1440 — Texte grec, avec un commentaire critique et explicatif par E. Tournier. Svo. Paris, 1867. 6s.
- 1441 — Tragedies literally translated into English prose, with notes. Svo. Oxford, 1833. Cf. 2s. 6d.
- 1442 — Ajax, commentario perpetuo illustr. Ch. A. Lobeck. Ed. III. Svo. Berolini, 1866. 3s.
- 1443 — Ajax, Antigone, Philoctetes, brevi annotatione instr. M. Seyffert. 3 parts. Svo. 1865-67. 2s. 6d.
- 1444 — Philoctetes, critically revised and explained by F. H. M. Blaydes. Svo. 1870. Cf. 2s.
- 1445 — Fragmenta, rec. et annotatione instr. F. H. Bothe. Svo. Lipsiae, 1846. Hf. cf. 2s. 6d.
- 1446 — 15 Dissertations on, by Brambach (1870), Fairbanks (1886), Hooykaas (1896), Lübker (1851-55, 1853), Morstadt (1863), G. H. Müller (1878), Piderit (1857), Seyffert (1864), Tyrrell (1891), Ullrich (1884), Wecklein (1884), and others. 6s.
- 1447 — BEATSON (B. W.) Index graecitatis Sophocleae. Svo. Cambridge, 1830. Bds. 3s. 6d.
- 1448 — BLAYDES (F. H. M.) Spicilegium Sophocleum commentarium perpetuum in septem fabulas Sophoclis continens. Svo. Halis Sax., 1903. (Publ. at 10s.) 6s.
- 1449 — BRAMBACH (W.) Metrische Studien zu Sophokles. Svo. Leipzig, 1869. 1s. 6d.
- 1450 — DINDORF (G.) Annotationes ad Sophoclis tragoedias. Svo. Oxonii, 1836. Cl. 2s. 6d.
- 1451 — ELLENDT (F.) Lexicon Sophocleum. 2 vols. Svo. Regiomonti, 1835. Cf. 10s. 6d.
- 1452 — HESSE (O.) Studien zu Sophokles. Svo. Leipzig, 1880. (8s.) 3s. 6d.
- 1453 — RITSCHL (F.) De cantico Oedipi Colonei. 4to. 1862. 1s.
- 1454 — Scholia in Soph. e cod. Laurentiano descripsit P. Elmsley. Svo. 1825. Hf. cf. 3s.
- 1455 **SOSITHEUS**. EICHSTAEDT (H. C. A.) De dramate Graecorum comico-satyriceo inprimis de Sositheo Lyttersa. Svo. 1818. 2s.
- 1456 **SPHAERA**. Neue griechische Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Sternkunde von F. Boll. Svo. Leipzig, 1903. 6 plates and 19 illustrations in the text. 18s.
- 1457 **STATII** opera, notis variorum ed. ill. J. Veenhusen. Svo. Lugd. Bat., 1671. Cf. 4s. 6d.
- 1458 — — another, very fine copy, in embossed calf gilt edges. 7s.
- 1459 — quae exstant omnia opera, selectis Marklandi aliorumque notis quibus suas addiderunt J. A. Amar et N. E. Lemaire. 4 vols. Svo. Paris, 1825. Sd. 14s.
- 1460 **STEPHANUS ALEXANDRINUS**. USENER (H.) de Steph. Alex. commentatio. 4to. 1880. 2s. 6d.
- 1461 **STOBAEUS** (JOA.) Sententiae ex thesauris Graecorum delectae, Eclogarum physicarum et ethicarum libri duo. Item loci communes sententiarum collecti per Antonium et Maximum Monachos. Omnia gr. et lat. Fol. Aureliae Allobr., 1609. Cf. 6s.

- 1461A **STOBAEI** Florilegium, graece, ed. Th. Gaisford. 4 vols. 8vo. Oxonii, 1822. *Fine copy in olive morocco gilt edges.* 15s.
- 1462 **STRABONIS** rerum geograph. libri XVII, gr. et lat., rec. ill. J. Ph. Sibenkees et C. H. Tzschucke. 7 vols. 8vo. Lips., 1796-1818. (£3 12s.) 16s.
- 1463 — — Fine copy on writing paper bound in vellum, marbled edges. £1 10s.
- 1464 — — Geographica, cur. A. Koray. 4 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1815-19. *Half calf gilt. Very fine copy of this rare and very esteemed edition.* £1 10s.
- 1465 — — Rerum geographicarum libri XVII, rec. G. Kramer, Ed. minor. 2 vols. 8vo. Berol., 1852. (8s.) 3s.
- 1467 — — gr. et lat., edd. C. Müller et F. Dübner. Roy. 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1853, 77. 15 coloured maps. £1 8s.
- 1467A — — Géographie de Strabon, traduite du grec en français (par de La Porte du Theil, Coray et Letroune, avec des notes et une introduction par Gosselin). 5 vols. Large 4to. Paris, Imprimerie Impériale, 1805-19. *Cf.* £2 2s.
- 1468 **SUETONIUS** ex. rec. J. G. Graevii cum ejusdem animadversionibus ut et commentario integro variorum. Ed. II. 4to. Hagae Com., 1691. *Vell.* 6s.
- 1469 — — opera continuo commentario ill. D. C. G. Baumgarten-Crusius. 3 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1816-18. *8d.* (27s.) 10s. 6d.
- 1470 — — Baumgarten-Crusii commentario et annotationibus variorum suisque ed. C. B. Hase. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1823. *Hf. cf.* 9s. 6d.
- 1471 **SUIDAE** Lexicon, ex rec. Imm. Bekkeri. Large 8vo. Berolini, 1854. 12s.
- 1471A — — Tour (J.) Emendationes in Suidam et Hesychium, et alios lexicographos graecos. 4 vols. 8vo. Oxonii, 1790. 7s. 6d.
- 1472 **SULPICIUS SEVERUS.** La chronique de Sulpice Sévère. Texte critique, traduction et commentaire. Livre I. avec prolegomènes par A. Lavertujon. 4to. Paris, 1896. (10 frs.) 4s.
- 1472A **SYNCELLUS** (Geo.) et **NICEPHORUS CP.**, graece et latine, ex rec. G. Dindorfii. 2 vols. 8vo. Bonnæ, 1829. *Hf. cf.* 12s.
- 1472B **SYNESIUS VON KYRENE.** Briefe. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Attizismus im IV. und V. Jahrhundert, von W. Fritz. Svo. Leipzig, 1898. *Seved.* (8 marks.) 4s.
- 1473 **TACITI** opera quae exstant, integris Lipsii et aliorum notis ed. suasque adiecit J. F. Gronovius. 4 vols. 8vo. Amstelod., Dan. Elzevir, 1672. *Cf.* 7s. 6d.
- 1473A — — ex rec. (et cum notis) J. A. Ernesti, cur. J. J. Oberlinus. 4 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1801 (London, 1825). *Hf. bound.* 4s.
- 1473C — — cum commentario J. J. Oberlin et notis variorum ed. J. Naudet. 6 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1820. *Seved.* 12s. 6d.
- 1473D — — Tacitus ab Lipsio, Gronovio, Heinsio, Ernestio, Wolfio emendatus et illustratus ab Imm. Bekkero recognitus. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1831. *Hf. cf.* 4s. 6d.
- 1473E — — opera, commentario critico et exegetico illustrata, ed. F. Ritter. 4 vols. in 2. 8vo. Cambridge, 1848. *Hf. cf.* 7s. 6d.
- TACITUS**—continued.
- 1474 — — rec. atque interpretatus est J. G. Orellius. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. Turici, 1846-48. *Cf.* 8s.
- 1475 — — Ed. II. Vol. I. Annales. Imp. 8vo. Turici, 1859. *Seved.* (16s.) 6s.
- 1476 — — ed. F. Haase. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1855. *Seved.* 2s. 6d.
- 1476A — — Works with an essay on his life and genius, notes, etc., by A. Murphy. 8 vols. 8vo. London, 1808. *Cf.* 7s. 6d.
- 1477 — — Annales, erklärt von K. Nipperdey-Andresen. Ed. VII. et III. 2 vols in one. Crown 8vo. Berlin, 1879, 73. 3s.
- 1478 — — Annales Lib. I.-VI. Avec commentaire critique, philologique et explicatif par E. Jacob. 8vo. Paris, 1885. *Seved.* 3s.
- 1479 — — Historiarum libri qui supersunt erklärt von C. Heraeus. Ed. III. et II. 2 vols. in one. 8vo. Leipzig, 1877, 75. Cloth. 2s.
- 1480 — — The History of Tacitus, translated into English by A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb. With notes and a map. 8vo. Cambridge, 1864. *Cloth.* 4s. 6d.
- 1481 — — Agricola, rec. P. H. Peerlkamp. Ed. II. 8vo. Leidæ, 1864. *Cloth.* 1s. 6d.
- 1482 — — Dialogus de oratoribus, Latin and German, by C. H. Krauss. 8vo. Stuttgart, 1882. 1s.
- 1483 — — **BOETTICHER** (G.) Lexicon Taciteum, praemissis de Taciti stilo, vita et scriptis prolegomenis. 8vo. Berolini, 1830. *Hf. cf.* 5s.
- 1484 — — **BOISSIER** (G.) Tacite. 12mo. Paris, 1903. 3s.
- 1485 — — **CLASON** (O.) Tacitus und Sueton. 8vo. Breslau, 1870. 1s.
- 1486 — — **GERBER** (A.) et **GREEF** (A.) Lexicon Taciteum. Large 8vo. Lipsiae, 1903. £2 17s.
- 1487 — — **RUPERTI** (G. A.) Commentarius in Taciti Annales. 8vo. Londini, 1825. *Hf. cf.* 1s. 6d.
- 1488 — — **SCHUMACHER** (L.) de Tacito Germaniae geographo. 4to. 1886. 1s.
- 1489 **TATIANI** Oratio ad Graecos. Hermiae Irrisio gentilium philosophorum, graece et latine, notis variorum illustr. W. Worth. 8vo. Oxoniae, 1700. *Vell.* 2s. 6d.
- 1490 — — Rede an die Griechen, übersetzt und eingeleitet von Ad. Harnack. 4to. 1884. 1s.
- 1491 **TERENTIANUS MAURUS** de litteris syllabis pedibus et metris, cum notis L. Santenii ed. D. J. van Lennep. 4to. Traiecti ad Rh., 1825. 5s.
- 1492 — — rec. C. Lachmann. 12mo. 1836. 1s.
- 1493 **TERENTIUS.** Comoediae sex cum Donati et Calphurnii commentariis. 4to. Paris, Rob. Stephanus, 1541 (1542). *Cf.* 6s.
- 1494 — — acc. Donati commentarius integer et selectae variorum notae. 8vo. Lugd. Bat., F. Hackius, 1644. *Vell.* 3s. 6d.
- 1495 — — rec. notasque suas et Gabr. Faerni addidit Rich. Bentleius. Acc. Phaedri fabulae et Publii Syri aliorumque veterum sententiae. 4to. Amsterdam, 1727. *Cf.* 7s. 6d.
- 1496 — — ad fidem optimarum editionum expressae. 18mo. Edinburgi, 1758. *Cf.* 2s. 6d.
- 1497 — — ad fidem editionis Zeunianae accurate recensitae. 18mo. London, 1825. *Frontispiece. Half green morocco, gilt edges.* 3s. 6d.
- A very neat pocket-edition on vellum paper.

TERENTIUS—continued.

- 1498 — cum interpretatione Donati et Calphurnii et commentario perpetuo ed. A. H. Westervohius, cur G. Stallbaum. 6 vols. in 2. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1830-31. *Hf. cf.* 6s.
- 1499 — cum notis variorum et scholiis anonymi (fortasse Calliopii) ed. J. A. Giles. 8vo. Londini, 1837. *Hf. cf.* 3s.
- 1500 — cum scholiis Donati et Euphrati commentariis ed. R. Klotz. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1838-40. (18s.) 4s. 6d.
- 1501 — With a commentary by E. St. John Parry. 8vo. London, 1857. *Cloth.* (18s.) 4s. 6d.
- 1502 — — rec. C. Dziatzko. 8vo. 1884. 1s. 6d.
- 1503 — HARTMAN (J. J.) De Terentio et Donato. 8vo. Leidae, 1895. 239 pp. 3s.
- 1504 — HAULER (E.) Terentiana. Quaestiones cum specimine lexic. 8vo. 1882. 1s.
- 1505 — IHNE (G.) Quaestiones Terentianae. 8vo. Bonnae, 1843. 1s.
- 1506 — REHNKEN (D.) in Terentii comoedias dictata, cura L. Schopeni. 8vo. Bonnae, 1825. *Cf.* 2s.
- 1507 — SABBADINI (R.) Il commento di Donato a Terenzio. 8vo. Catania, 1893. 134 pp. (Extr.) 2s. 6d.
- 1508 TESTAMENTUM VETUS graece et lat., juxta LXX. interpretes cum latina translatione vulgatae editionis cura J. N. Jager. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. Paris, 1839. *Hf. cf.* Several leaves slightly spotted. 10s. 6d.
- 1509 THEOCRITI Eidyllia trigintasex latino carmine reddita H. Eobano Hesso interprete. 18mo. Francofurti, P. Brubach, 1553. *Red morocco.* 5s.
- 1510 — Idyllia XXXVI. Epigrammata XIX. Bipennis et Ala. 4to. Paris, Guil. Morelius, 1561. *Red morocco extra.* 10s. 6d.
- 1511 — quae extant cum graecis scholiis. Crown 8vo. Londini, 1759. *Cf.* 1s.
- 1512 — reliquiae, graece et latine, notis variorum suisque ed. Th. Kiessling. Acc. scholia et indices. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1819. *Seved.* (11s.) 2s.
- 1513 — — graece, rec. et illustr. E. F. Wuestemann. 8vo. Gothae, 1830. 1s. 6d.
- 1514 — GEBAUER (G. A.) De poetarum graecorum bucolicorum inprimis Theocriti carminibus in eclogis a Vergilio expressis libri duo. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1861. (8s.) 3s.
- 1515 THEOCRITI, MOSCHI, BIONIS, SIMMII quae extant, cum graecis in Theocritum scholiis, opera D. Heinsii. Acc. Jos. Scaligeri, Is. Casauboni et D. Heinsii notae. 4to. Ex Bibliopolio Commeliano, 1604. *Vellum.* 5s.
- 1516 — Carmina bucolica, gr. et lat., ed. L. C. Valckenauer. 8vo. Lugd. Bat., 1779. *Hf. cf.* 3s. 6d.
- 1517 — Idyllia omnia a B. Zamagna lat. versibus expressa. 8vo. Senis, 1788. *Cf.* 1s.
- 1518 — tertium ed. A. Meineke. 8vo. Berolini, 1856. *Seved.* 4s. 6d.
- 1519 — THEOCRITUS, BION et MOSCHUS, NICANDER, OPIANUS, MARCELLUS SIDETES, PHILES, ARATUS, MANETHO, MAXIMUS. Omnia gr. et lat. Roy. 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1862. 12s.
- 1520 — SCHOLIA Theocriti, Nicandri et Oppiani, gr. et lat., ed. U. C. Bussemaker. Royal 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1849. 12s.
- 1521 THEOGNIDIS reliquiae, commentationem criticam et notas adiecit F. Th. Welcker. 8vo. 1826. *Boards.* 4s. 6d.
- 1522 — THEOGNIS RESTITUTUS. The personal history of the poet deduced from an analysis of his fragments, translated and with commentary by John Hookham Frere. 4to. Malta, 1842. Privately printed. 10s. 6d.
- 1523 THEONIS SMYRNAEI liber de Astronomia cum Sereni fragmento, gr. et lat., notis ill. Th. H. Martin. 8vo. Paris, 1849. 8 plates. *Very rare.* 18s.
- 1524 THEOPHANES CONFESSOR. KRUMBACHER (K.) Eine neue Vita des Theophanes Confessor. 8vo. 1897. 1s.
- 1525 THEOPHILI ANTECESSORIS Paraphrasis graeca institutionum Caesarearum, gr. et lat. cum notis variorum, ed. G. O. Reitz. 4to. Hague Com., 1751. *Vell.* 10s. 6d.
- 1526 — — gr. et lat., rec. prolegomenis notis criticis instr. E. C. Ferrini. 2 vols. 8vo. Berolini, 1884-97. (27s.) 18s.
- 1527 THEOPHILI PROTOSPATHORII de corporis humani fabrica libri V., gr. et lat. ed. G. A. Greenhill. 8vo. Oxonii, 1842. *Cloth.* 4s. 6d.
- 1528 THEOPOMPI Fragmenta, ed. illustr. commentationem de vita et scriptis praemisit R. H. E. Wichers. 8vo. Lugd. Bat., 1829. *Seved.* 3s. 6d.
- 1529 THEOPHRASTI quae supersunt opera, gr. et lat., emendavit et explicavit J. G. Schneider. 5 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1818-21. *Seved.* (84s.) 15s.
- 1530 — opera omnia, graece et latine, ed. F. Wimmer. Roy. 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1866. 12s.
- 1531 — Notationes morum, gr. et lat., Is. Casaubonus rec. et commentario illustravit. 12mo. Lugduni, 1612. *Vell.* 3s.
- 1532 — — Theophrasti characteres, MARCUS ANTONINUS, EPICTETI dissertationes, SIMPLICIUS, CEBES, MAXIMUS TYRIUS, omnia gr. et lat., ed. F. Dübner. Roy. 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1877. 12s.
- 1533 — Les caractères de Theophraste, traduits du grec, avec les caractères ou les mœurs de ce siècle, par La Bruyère. Première édition complète avec des éclaircissements historiques par le Baron Walckenauer. 8vo. Paris, 1845. *Hf. Cf.* 4s.
- 1534 — Historia de plantis, et de causis plantarum, et quosdam alios ipsius libri, graece (cura J. B. Camotii). 12mo. Venetiis, apud Aldi filios, 1552. 10s. 6d.
Forms the supplementary or sixth, very rare, volume of Camotius' Aristotle.
- 1535 — Historia et de causis plantarum, Versio latina, cura J. G. Schneider. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1818. *Cl., uncut.* 2s. 6d.
- 1536 THOMAS MAGISTER 'Ονοματων ἀττικων ἐκλογαι, gr. ex dispositione Nic. Blancardi, cum variorum [suisque notis ed. J. St. Bernard. 8vo. Lugd. Bat., 1757. *Vell.* 5s. Best edition.
- 1537 THUCYDIDIS Bellum Peloponesiacum cum scholiis graecis et notis variorum ed. E. F. Poppo. Acc. indices locupletissimi. 4 vols. in 11. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1821-51. *Hf. Cf.* £1 12s.

THUCYDIDES—continued.

- 1538 — The history of the Peloponnesian war (in Greek) illustrated by maps taken entirely from actual surveys, with notes chiefly historical and geographical by Th. Arnold. 3 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1835. *Fine copy in half calf, carmine edges.* 12s. 6d.
- 1539 — de bello peloponnesiaco libri octo, perpetua annotatione illustr. F. Goeller. Ed. II. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1836. *Seewed.* 2s. 6d.
- 1540 — — cum nova translatione lat. F. Haasii. Acc. Marcellini vita, scholia graeca et indices. Roy. 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1840. *Hf. Cf.* 7s. 6d.
- 1542 — — explanavit E. F. Poppo. 4 vols. and Supplement (de historia Thucydidea) in 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1866, 47, 51. *Hf. Cf.* 7s. 6d.
- 1553 — — ed. J. M. Stahl. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1873. *Seewed. Vellum paper.* 6s.
- 1554 — historiarum libri VI–VIII ad optimos codices denuo collatos rec. C. Hude. 8vo. Hauniae, 1890. 2s. 6d.
- 1555 — de bello peloponnesiaco libri VIII, iterum rec. Imm. Bekker. Cr. 8vo. Berolini, 1892. 3s.
- 1556 — ad optimos codices denno ab ipso collatos rec. C. Hude. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1898–1901. 18s.
- 1557 — Thucydides, chiefly from the translation of Hobbes of Malmesbury. A new edition with notes and marginal analysis. 8vo. Oxford, 1841. *Bds.* 3s. 6d.
- 1558 — HACHE (R.) De participio Thucydideo I., 4, 5. 4to. 1882. 1s.
- 1558A — HERBST (L.) Ueber Cobets Emendationen zu Thucydides. 8vo. Leipzig, 1857. 1s.
- 1558B — KRÜGER (K. W.) Leben des Thukydides. 8vo. Berlin. (Krit. Anal. I.) 1s. 6d.
- 1559 — STAHL, quaestiones grammaticae ad Thucydidem pertinentes. 8vo. 1886. 1s.
- 1559A — — ULLRICH, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Thukydides. 4to. 1846. 183 pp. 2s.
- 1560 — VITAE Thucydidis a veteribus grammaticis conscriptae; notae Dukeri integrae aliorum selectae edd. G. Gervinus et F. C. Hertlein. 2 vols. 8vo. Francofurti, 1830–35. *Cloth.* 3s. 6d.
- 1561 TIBULLI quae supersunt omnia opera, novis commentariis vita auctoris et indice absolutissimo instr. Ph. A. de Golbéry. 8vo. Paris, 1826. *Seewed.* 4s. 6d.
- 1562 — — ex rec. C. Lachmanni passim mutata explicuit L. Dissen. 2 vols. 8vo. Gottingae, 1835. *Seewed. Vell. paper.* 7s. 6d.
- 1563 — Elegiae, ed. E. Hiller. 8vo. 1885. 1s.
- 1564 TIMAIOS VON TAUROMENION. CLASEN (Ch.) Historisch-kritische Untersuchungen über Timaios von Taurom. 8vo. 1883. 1s. 6d.
- 1565 TRAGICORUM GRAECORUM fragmenta, rec. Aug. Nauck. Ed. II. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1889. £1 6s.
- 1566 — Poetarum tragicorum graecorum fragmenta exceptis Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis reliquis, ed. F. G. Wagner. 8vo. Vratislaviae, 1848. 2s. 6d.

TRAGICI GRAECI—continued.

- 1567 — — BEATSON (B. W.) Index graecitatis Aeschyleae, Euripidae, et Sophocleae. 3 vols. in 2. 8vo. Cambridge, 1830. *Cf.* £1 1s.
- 1568 — — WEIL (H.) De tragœdiorum graecarum cum rebus publicis conjunctione. 8vo. Paris, 1844. 1s.
- 1569 — — WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, de tragicorum graecorum fragmentis. 8vo. 1893. 1s.
- 1570 TRYPHIODORUS. WEINBERGER (W.) Studien zu Tryphiodorus und Kolluth. 8vo. 1896. 1s.
- 1571 TZETZAE Allegoriae Iliadis, acc. Pselli allegoriae quarum una inedita cur. J. F. Boissonade. 8vo. Paris, 1851. 6s.
- 1572 ULPIANI quae vocant fragmenta quartum emendavit E. Bücking. 12mo. Lipsiae, 1855. 1s.
- 1573 — BREMER (F. P.) De Dom. Ulpiani institutionibus, acc. institutionum reliquiae. 8vo. Bonn, 1863. 1s. 6d.
- 1574 VALERIUS FLACCUS, Argonautica, Latin and French, by J. J. A. Caussin de Perceval. 8vo. Paris, Panckoucke, 1836. 2s. 6d.
- 1575 VALERIUS MAXIMUS. Libri novem factorum dictorumque memorabilium cum notis integris Glareani, Pighii, J. Lipsii et aliorum ed. suasque adjecit A. Torrenius. 2 vols. 4to. Leidae, 1726. *Fine copy on large paper, bound in Russia.* 12s. 6d.
- 1576 — — et Jul. Obsequens cum supplementis C. Lycosthenis et selectis variorum notis ed. C. B. Hase. 3 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1822. *Seewed.* 6s.
- 1577 VARRO (Terentius) Eumenidum reliquiae, rec. ill. Th. Roeper. 3 parts. 4to. 1858. 4s.
- 1578 — VAHLEN (Joh.) in M. Terentii Varronis saturarum menippearum reliquias collectanea. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1855. 2s. 6d.
- 1579 VELLEII PATERCULI quae supersunt, cum integris scholiis, notis, variis lectionibus doctorum cur. P. Burmanno. 8vo. Rotterdami, 1756. 4s.
- 1580 VERGILIUS. Opera, cum integris commentariis Servii, Philargyrii, Pierii, et Scaligeri et Lindenbrogii notis rec. P. Masvicius. 2 vols. 4to. Leovardiae, 1717. *Very fine copy in calf gilt edges.* 10s. 6d.
- 1581 — cura St. A. Philippe. 3 vols. 18mo. Paris, Barbou, 1754. *Calf gilt edges.* 3s. 6d.
- 1582 — perpetua adnotatione illustrata a Ch. G. Heyne. Acc. index uberrimus. 4 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1767. *Cf.* 4s.
- 1583 — — Ed. IV. cur. G. Ph. E. Wagner. 5 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1830–41. *Seewed.* (28s.) 12s.
- 1584 — — rec. O. Ribbeck. Acc. prolegomena et appendix Vergiliana. 5 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1859–68. *Seewed. Out of print.* £2 5s.
- 1585 — The Appendix separately. 1868. 5s.
- 1586 — The works, with commentary and appendix by B. H. Kennedy. 12mo. London, 1876. *Cloth.* 2s. 6d.
- 1587 — Aeneis, ed. illustr. P. H. Peerlkamp. 2 vols. 8vo. Leidae, 1843. (18s.) 6s.
- 1588 — — annotatione perpetua illustravit C. G. Gossrau. 8vo. Quedlinburgi, 1846. *Hf. cf.* 5s. 6d.

VER
1589

1590

1591

1592

1593

1593

1594

1595

1596

1597

1598

Pro
1599

1600

1601

1602

1603

1604

1604

1605

1606

1607

1608

1609

VERGILIUS—continued.

- 1589 — Les bucoliques, trad. en vers français, texte en regard. 8vo. Paris, 1835. *Seved.* 1s. 6d.
- 1590 — Les géorgiques, traduites en vers français par L. Larombière. Texte en regard. 8vo. Paris, 1882. *Seved.* 2s. 6d.
- 1591 — BUTLER (G.) Codex Vergilianus qui nuper ex bibliotheca Canonici Abbatis Venetiani Bodleianae accessit cum Wagneri textu collatus. 8vo. Oxonii, 1854. *Hf. bnd.* 2s.
- 1592 — GANZENMÜLLER (C.) Beiträge zur Ciris. 8vo. Leipzig, 1894. 1s.
- 1593 — LERSCH (L.) De morum in Virgilio Aeneide habitu. 8vo. Bonn, 1836. 112pp. 1s. 6d.
- 1593A — VOSS (J. H.) Commentarii Virgiliani, lat. ed. Th. F. G. Reinhardt. 12mo. 1838. *Cl.* 2s.
- 1594 VIBIUS SEQUESTER de fluminibus fontibus lacubus nemoribus paludibus montibus gentibus quorum apud poetas mentio fit, notis variorum suisque ed. J. J. Oberlinus. 8vo. Argentorati, 1778. *Cf.* 3s.
- 1595 VICTOR (Sextus Aurel.). Historia romana, cum notis integris Machanaci, Vineti, A. Schotti, J. Gruteri . . . cur J. Arntzenius. 4to. Amstelodami, 1733. *Numerous medalion portraits. Dutch coll., fine copy.* 6s.
- 1596 — Originis gentis romane liber, rec. ill. F. Schroeter. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1829. 2s. 6d.
- 1597 — Virorum illustrium liber, rec. ill. F. Schroeter. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1831. 2s. 6d.
- 1598 VITRUVIUS. De architectura libri decem, rec. suisque et virorum doctorum annotationibus ill. J. G. Schneider. 3 vols. Royal 8vo. Lipsiae, 1897. *Very fine copy on large paper, bound in Russia.* £1 1s.
- From Sir Robert Peel's Library with his bookplate.
- 1599 XENOPHANIS carminum reliquiae explicuit placita illustravit S. Karsten. 8vo. Amstelod., 1830. 4s. 6d.
- 1600 XENOPHONTIS Opera rec. et interpretatus est J. G. Schneider. 6 vols. in 3. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1795. *Dutch coll.* 7s. 6d.
- 1601 — — gr. et lat., ed. L. Dindorf. Roy. 8vo. Paris, Didot, 1885. 12s.
- 1602 — — rec. et praefatus est L. Dindorf. 5 vols. in 2. 12mo. Lipsiae, 1862. *Hf. cf.* 3s. 6d.
- 1603 — — ed. G. Sauppe. 5 vols. in 2. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1865-66. *Fell. paper. Hf. cf. top gilt mar.* 7s. 6d.
- 1604 — — ed. G. Sauppe. 5 vols. 8vo. 1865. *Seved.* 4s.
- 1604A — Complete works translated by Ashley, Spelman, Smith, Fielding, and others. 8vo. 1876. *Cf.* 3s.
- 1605 — Cyri Anabasis, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen und Lexicon von K. W. Krüger. 4th Edition. 8vo. Berlin, 1854. *Hf. bnd.* 2s. 6d.
- 1606 — — ed. C. G. Cobet. Ed. IV. 12mo. Lugd. Bat., 1886. 2s. 6d.
- 1607 — — gr. et lat., notis H. Stephani, Leunclavii, Ae. Porti et Mureti ed. Th. Hutchinson. 4to. Oxonii, 1735. *Cf.* 5s.
- 1608 — Cyropaedia, rec. ill. J. G. Schneider. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1815. 1s. 6d.
- 1609 — — rec. et commentariis instr. F. A. Bornemann. 8vo. Gothae, 1828. *Hf. cf.* 3s. 6d.

XENOPHON—continued.

- 1610 — Cyropaedia, cum notis variorum, curavit F. A. Bornemann. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1838. *Cloth.* 4s.
- 1611 — — erklärt von L. Breitenbach. 2 parts in 1 vol. 8vo. Leipzig, 1875. *Cloth.* 1s. 6d.
- 1612 — The Cyropaedia and the Hellenics, literally translated by Rev. J. S. Watson and Rev. H. Dale. 12mo. London, Bohn, 1855. *Cloth.* 2s.
- 1613 — Historia graeca, ed. C. G. Cobet. Ed. III. 12mo. Lugd. Bat., 1888. 2s. 6d.
- 1614 — Le guerre de Greci nelle quali si contiene la presa di Athens etc. Tradotto nell' Italiano per Francesco Strozzi. Small 4to. Venetia, 1550. *Fell. Fine portrait of Strozzi.* 4s.
- 1615 — Convivium, ed. et annotationes criticae adiecit E. Mehler. 8vo. Lugd. Bat., 1850. 1s.
- 1616 — Symposium, Greek and German, with explanatory German notes by G. F. Rettig. 12mo. 1881. 2s.
- 1617 — Oeconomicus, Convivium, Hiero, Agesilaus, rec. ill. J. G. Schneider. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1805. *Cf.* 1s.
- 1618 — Opuscula politica equestria et venatoria, rec. ill. J. G. Schneider. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1815. 1s. 6d.
- 1619 — GEEL (J.) De Xen. Apologia Socratis . . . commentatio. 4to. 1836. 1s.
- 1620 — GEMOLL (W.) Bemerkungen zu Xenophons Anabasis. 8vo. 1897. 1s.
- 1621 — JOEL (K.) Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates. 2 vols. in 3. 8vo. Berlin, 1901. *Sol.* (42 Mark.) £1 1s.
- 1622 — LINCKE (C.) De Xen. Cyropaediae interpolationibus. 8vo. 1874. 1s.
- 1622A — List of the printed books on Xenophon in the British Museum. Fol. 1883. 1s.
- 1622B — SAUTPE (G.) Lexilogus Xenophontis sive index Xenophontis grammaticus. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1869. *Hf. Cf.* 3s.
- 1623 — SCHENKL (K.) Xenophontische Studien. 2 parts. 8vo. Wien, 1869, 75. 2s.
- 1624 — — Berichte über die Xenophon betr. Schriften welche 1879-1888 erschienen sind. 8vo. (Extr.) 1s.
- 1625 — SEELMANN (F.) De historia Xen. in Cyropaedia fide. 4to. 1s.
- 1625A — SIMON (J. A.) Xenophon-Studien. 4 parts. 4to. 1888, 89. 3s. 6d.
- 1626 — STRECKER (W.) und H. KIEPERT. Beiträge zur geographischen Erklärung des Rückzugs der Zehntausend durch das armenische Hochland. 8vo. 1870. Large folding map. 1s. 6d.
- 1627 — STURZ (F. G.) Lexicon Xenophonticum. 4 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1801. *Cf.* 10s. 6d.
- 1628 ZONARAE et PHOTII Lexica ex codicibus mss. nunc primum edita observationibus illustrata (Zonaras ed. J. A. H. Tittmann, Photius ed. G. Hermann.) 3 vols. 4to. Lipsiae, 1808. (£3 12s.) £1 1s.
- 1629 — Annales, gr. et lat., ex rec. M. Pinderi. Vol. II. (Annales lib. VII-XII.) Bonnae, 1844. *Hf. cf.* 3s. 6d.
- 1630 ZOSIMI de zythorum confectione. Acc. historia zythorum et cerevisiarum quarum apud veteres mentio fit scripsit Ch. G. Gruner. 8vo. Solisbaci, 1814. *Hf. cf.* 2s.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Scriptorium Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.

BERLINER PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.—"Die Bibliotheca Oxoniensis der so bedeutsame Ausgaben angehören wie Burnet's Platon, Clark's Reden Cicero's."

EURIPIDIS TRAGOEDIAE. Tom. II. Edited by G. G. A. MURRAY. Crown 8vo, paper covers, 3s.; limp cloth, 3s. 6d.

HOMERI ILIAS. Edited by D. B. MONRO and T. W. ALLEN. Two Vols. Crown 8vo, paper covers, 2s. 6d. each; limp cloth, 3s. each; on Oxford India paper, complete, 7s.

HERMATHENA.—"The conservatism which is sometimes objected to as the outstanding feature of the Oxford Library is here, in this member of the Series, if anywhere, wholly appropriate. For, briefly, the task of an editor of Homer is to present the text which was in use at Athens in the sixth century B.C."

PLATONIS OPERA. Tom. III. (Tetralogias v-vii continens.) Edited by J. BURNET. Crown 8vo, paper covers, 5s.; limp cloth, 6s.; on Oxford India paper, 7s.

HERMATHENA.—"This excellent edition of Plato progresses apace under Mr. Burnet's skilful hands. The same width and accuracy which marked the critical apparatus of the former volumes are discoverable also in this. The same sober judgement, which is loth to introduce into the text any except the most rigorously certain emendations, characterizes this as well as the parts of Plato hitherto published from the Clarendon Press. The notes record all that ordinary readers require for the knowledge of what scholars have been doing for the text. . . . Nothing of essential importance, so far as we can observe, seems to have escaped Mr. Burnet. . . . Of the few changes which he has independently introduced we have nothing but what is favourable to say. They all appear to contain the intrinsic marks of soundness."

DEMOSTHENIS ORATIONES. Tom. I. Edited by S. H. BUTCHER. Crown 8vo, paper covers, 4s.; limp cloth, 4s. 6d.

NEUE PHILOLOGISCHE RUNDSCHAU.—"Dass sich Butcher mit der grossen Ausgabe von Friedr. Blass auseinandersetzt, ist selbstverständlich. Er erkennt mit Dankbarkeit die gewaltigen Verdienste des deutschen Gelehrten um die Reden des Demosthenes an, aber jene Verdienste machen ihn nicht blind gegen die Fehler seiner Textgestaltung, die sich wohl jedem Unbefangenen von selbst aufdrängen. Blass legt vor allem den die Stellen aus Demosthenes zitirenden oder ihm nachahmenden Rhetoren und Sophisten, die anerkanntermassen häufig aus dem Gedächtniss zitierten und nicht selten geringwertige Demosthenes Exemplare in der Hand hatten, viel zu viel Gewicht bei. Ferner lässt er sich im Übermass in der Textgestaltung von seiner Theorie über den oratorischen Numerus, den Hiatz und die Vermeidung von mehr als zwei aufeinanderfolgenden kurzen Silben leiten. So hat er denn den Demosthenischen Text weniger nach den Handschriften gestaltet, als vielmehr aus den Handschriften, den Griechischen Gelehrten und seiner unhaltbaren Theorie vom Rhythmus willkürlich einen neuen Text geschaffen. Butcher hat nun, indem er wieder die handschriftliche Überlieferung zur Grundlage der Textgestaltung nahm und in besonnener Weise auf die früheren Herausgeber des Demosthenes zurückging, eine eminent konservative Tat vollbracht."

CATULLI CARMINA. Edited by R. ELLIS. Paper covers, 2s.; limp cloth, 2s. 6d.

ATHENÆUM.—"Needs no recommendation. A ripe knowledge than Prof. Ellis's of all that concerns Catullus it would be impossible to find, for it is more than thirty years since he first published his celebrated critical text of the most poetical of the Latin poets, with whom his name must always be associated. A brief but able discussion of the MS. sources is prefixed to the volume, and the text which follows exhibits the reading of MSS., having emendations, however likely, for the bottom of the page. This is a sound plan, especially since an obelus marks desperate passages."

HERMATHENA.—"It is needless to say that this work is well done. We have for many years been accustomed to regard Prof. Robinson Ellis as far the greatest English authority on Catullus."

PERSI ET JUVENALIS SATURAE. Edited by S. G. OWEN. Crown 8vo, paper covers, 2s. 6d.; limp cloth, 3s.; on Oxford India paper, 4s.

H. POLSTORFF in NEUE PHILOLOGISCHE RUNDSCHAU.—"Von Bedeutung ist Owens Ausgabe für Juvenal; beim heutigen Stande der Forschung unentbehrlich. . . . Der text Juvenals hat an mehr als eine Stelle durch die Behandlung gewonnen."

LITERARISCHES CENTRALBLATT.—"Das Englische Konkurrenz-unternehmen zu Teubner's Bibliotheca schreitet rasch fort. Der vorliegende Band wird mit Beifall angenommen werden."

WOCHENSCHRIFT FÜR KLASSISCHE PHILOGIE.—"Man darf sich mit den kritischen Grundsätzen nach denen in den vorliegenden Bandchen der bekannten Oxforder Klassiker-bibliothek verfahren ist, im Allgemeinen durchaus einverstanden Erklären."

ALREADY PUBLISHED.

ÆSCHYLUS—APOLLONIUS RHODIUS—ARISTOPHANES—CAESAR—CATULLUS—CICERO (ORATIONES, VOL. I., LETTERS AND RHETORICAL WORKS)—CORNELIUS NEPOS—DEMOSTHENES (VOL. I.)—EURIPIDES (VOLS. I.-II.)—HOMER (ILLIAD)—HORACE—LUCRITIUS—MARTIAL—PERSIUS AND JUVENAL—PLATO (VOLS. I.-III., AND REPUBLIC)—PLAUTUS (VOL. I.)—PROPERTIUS—TACITUS (MINOR WORKS)—TERENCE—THUCYDIDES—VIRGIL—XENOPHON.

HPOLLOY MIMIAMBOL. THE MIMES OF HERODAS. Edited, with Introduction, Critical Notes, Commentary, and Excursus, by J. ARBUTHNOT NAIEN, M.A. Demy 8vo, cloth, with facsimiles of the recently-discovered fragments and other illustrations, 12s. 6d. net.

HERMATHENA.—"This very useful book, the first of its kind in English. The editor aims at giving us a correct and readable text, faithful to the Papyrus as far as may be, explaining the sense everywhere, and illustrating the matter of his author from every source. His Introduction, historical, literary, and grammatical, is full and interesting."

HORACE, ODES, CARMEN SECULARE, AND EPODES. By E. C. WICKHAM, D.D. Second Edition, crown 8vo, cloth, 6s. SATIRES, EPISTLES, AND DE ARTE POETICA, 6s.

HORACE FOR ENGLISH READERS. Being a Translation of the Poems of Quintus Horatius Flaccus into English Prose. By E. C. WICKHAM, D.D. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

JOWETT'S TRANSLATION OF ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS, with Introduction and Analysis added by H. W. C. DAVIS, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo, in the same series as Prof. Jowett's Translation of *The Secret Dialogues of Plato*, Mr. Tozer's translation of *Dante*, Dean Wickham's translation of *Horace*, &c. [In the Press.]

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

